

**DEBATING HERESY:
CHANGING PERCEPTIONS OF ZAYNIYYA DERVISHES TOWARD
IBN 'ARABI IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY**

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
İSTANBUL ŞEHİR UNIVERSITY

BY

CANKAT KAPLAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
HISTORY

JULY 2017

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in History.

Examining Committee Members:

	DECISION	SIGNATURE
Assist. Prof. Abdurrahman Atçıl (Thesis Advisor)	<u>Accepted</u>	
Assoc. Prof. Abdülhamit Kırmızı	<u>Accepted</u>	
Assist. Prof. Ertuğrul İsmail Ökten	<u>Accepted</u>	

This is to confirm that this thesis complies with all the standards set by the Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences of İstanbul Şehir University.

Date

13.07.2017

Seal/Signature



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

First name, Last name: Cankat Kaplan

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Cankat Kaplan', written in a cursive style.

ABSTRACT

DEBATING HERESY: CHANGING PERCEPTIONS OF ZAYNIYYA DERVISHES TOWARD IBN 'ARABI IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

Kaplan, Cankat.

MA in History

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Abdurrahman Atçıl

July 2017, 201 Pages

This thesis deals with the ideas of Zayniyya dervishes toward Ibn 'Arabi and his thought and traces the differences between the Central Asian and Anatolian dervishes in this regard. The early Zayniyya sheikhs Zayn al-Din Khwafi and 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi, the respective founders of the Zayniyya tariqa in Central Asia and Anatolia, held a dim view of Ibn 'Arabi's thought, and saw the use of the science of letters as sufficient to implicate a person as heretic. In contrast to these early Zayniyya leaders, most prominent Anatolian Zayni dervishes later adopted a positive attitude toward Ibn 'Arabi, and Sheikh Vefa, one of the more prominent Anatolian Zaynis, himself practiced the science of letters.

I follow the changes in the stances toward Ibn 'Arabi by investigating the opinions of different Zayni dervishes, from Central Asia and Anatolia, on five controversial topics related to Ibn 'Arabi: the doctrine of oneness of being (*wahda al-wujud*), the doctrine of levels of existence (*maratib al-wujud*), and the issues of Pharaoh's faith, the seal of sainthood (*khatm al-walaya*) and comparison of sainthood with prophethood, and the state of infidels in hell.

Demonstrating the differences in the attitudes toward Ibn 'Arabi and, relatedly, in the definitions of heresy in Central Asia and Anatolia, this thesis argues that in the fifteenth century, heresy was not a universal term, but a context-bound historical one. Its meaning changed according to different political, social, and religious

concerns of various times and places. In addition, the thesis indicates that in the fifteenth century, tariqas did not produce facsimile disciples. Disciples did not feel themselves obliged to strictly follow their sheikhs in the tariqa, and easily adapted to their cultural and religious environments.

Keywords: Heresy, Ibn 'Arabi, Zayniyya, Anatolia, Central Asia, Sufism

ÖZ

İLHÂDİ TARTIŞMAK:

15. YÜZYILDA ZEYİNİYE TARİKATI DERVİŞLERİNİN İBN ARABİ HAKKINDAKİ DÜŞÜNCELERİNİN DEĞİŞİMİ

Kaplan, Cankat.

Tarih Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Abdurrahman Atçıl

Temmuz 2017, 201 Sayfa

Bu tez Zeyniye tarikatı dervişlerinin İbn Arabi ve onun düşüncesi hakkındaki görüşleri ile ilgilenir ve Orta Asya ve Anadolu coğrafyalarındaki Zeynilerin bu konu hakkındaki düşüncelerindeki farklılığı ortaya çıkartmaya çalışır. İlk Zeyniye şeyhlerinden olan ve sırasıyla Orta Asya ve Anadolu’da yaşayan Zeynüddin Hafi ve Abdüllatif Kudsi İbn Arabi düşüncesi hakkında olumsuz düşünmüş ve ilm-i huruf’u kullanmayı bir kişinin mülhid olması için yeterli sebep saymıştır. Bu ilk Zeyniye şeyhlerinin aksine önde gelen Anadolulu çoğu Zeyni dervişi İbn Arabi’ye karşı müspet bir tavır takınmış, ve Anadolulu Zeynilerden Şeyh Vefa ilm-i hurufu kullanmıştır.

Bu tezde, İbn Arabi’ye karşı takınılan tavrı İbn Arabi ile ilgili beş ihtilaflı konu üzerinden işliyorum. Bunlar vahdet-i vücud, meratibu’l-vücud, Firavun’un imanı, hatmü’l-velaye ve velayet-nübüvvet mukayesesı ve kafirlerin cehennemdeki durumu meseleleri. Zeyniye dervişlerinin ve şeyhlerinin İbn Arabi’ye karşı tavrını, tasavvuf tarihinde çokça tartışılan bu meseleler hakkında onların ne dediğine göre belirliyorum.

Bu tez, İbn Arabi’ye karşı takınılan tavırlardaki farklılıkları ve dolayısıyla ilhad kavramının anlamında ortaya çıkan Orta Asya ve Anadolu arasındaki farklılıkları göstererek, 15. Yüzyılda ilhadın evrensel bir kavram olmadığını, aksine tarihsel bir kavram olduğunu savunur. İlhad kavramının anlamı farklı zaman ve mekanlarda, farklı siyasi, sosyal ve dini kaygılara göre değişiklik göstermektedir. Bununla beraber, bu tezde, 15. Yüzyılda tarikatların birbirinin kopyası müritler yetiştirmedicine işaret

edilir. Dervişler kendilerini şeyhlerini sıkı sıkıya takip etmek zorunda hissetmezler ve kültürel ve dini çevreye kolaylıkla uyum sağlayabilirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İlhâd, Zeyniye, Anadolu, Orta Asya, Tasavvuf

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to my thesis advisor, Abdurrahman Atçıl for his priceless guidance, support, encouragement, and patience throughout the preparation process of this thesis. I would like to extend my thanks to Ertuğrul Ökten who gave invaluable advices for the hard issues I came across. They did not only teach me how to become a good scholar but also a good person. I also owe thanks to Ökten for kindly accepting to serve as my committee member and I am pleased to have his inspiring comments for this thesis. I am thankful to Engin Deniz Akarlı and Abdulhamit Kırmızı for showing me the way of how to become a good historian even if I could not accomplish yet. I am also deeply grateful to Mehmet Genç. His kindness and meticulousness taught me a lot. Above all, I want to thank Şehir University History department for providing me with a chance to meet such wonderful personalities.

The financial support from the Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture, Language, and History (T. C. Başbakanlık Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu) and Turkish Historical Society (Türk Tarih Kurumu) made this study possible. The libraries of the Center for Islamic Studies (İSAM) and Şehir University provided many primary and secondary sources that I used in this study. I am also grateful to Ebubekir Kızık who is the director of Caucasus Foundation (Kafkas Vakfı). I could not have written this thesis without the facilities that the Şehir University, ISAM library and Caucasus Foundation provided me. I would like to express many thanks to the staff of manuscript library of Süleymaniye, especially to Murat Serdar Saykal who made possible for me to acquire most of the primary sources.

During the process of writing this thesis, many dear friends and colleagues encouraged and supported me with their priceless friendships, helps, and advices. I am grateful to all of them and pleased to be able to express my thanks to Yusuf Selman İnanç, Mehmet Erken, Samet Yaşar, Abdullah Enes Özel, İrfan Ağaçaayaklar, Bünyamin Pınar, Onur Öner, Osman Furkan Aydın, İsmail Hakkı Kumbasar, Ahmet Emre Polat, and many others. I am also deeply grateful to Ahmet Murat Özel and his respected wife Zeynep Özel for not only their invaluable supports and advice but also

help for translating Persian phrases. I also would like to express many thanks to Ahmet Ağaçayaklar for his support.

Finally, I owe thanks to my family. My father Ziya Kaplan and mother Nazike Kaplan showed continuous self-sacrifice, support, affection, and understanding. My beloved sister Seda Kaplan was always by my side when I needed her. Her support during the process of writing this thesis was priceless. I am also indebted to my horse and dearest friend Gam-Kûsar for patiently and stoically listening to my deepest and most ridiculous anxieties even if I do not put into words.

To the one under whose feet lies my heaven...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iv
Öz	vi
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Table of Contents	xi
List of Abbreviations	xiii
Notes on Usage	xiv
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1. 1. Statement of the Problem and the Argument	1
1. 2. Literature Review	9
1. 3. Primary Sources.....	17
1. 3. 1. Books of Zayni Dervishes.....	17
1. 3. 2. Biographical Sources	21
2. ZAYN AL-DIN KHWAFI AND HIS IDEAS ABOUT THE RELIGIOUS LANDSCAPE OF HIS TIME	23
2. 1. The Question of the Sunnification Project of Shahrukh	23
2. 2. Zayn al-Din Khwafi (d. 1435)	33
2. 3. Khwafi and Ibn ‘Arabi	38
2. 4. Concluding Remarks	50
3. ‘ABD AL-LATIF QUDSI: THE TRANSITIONAL FIGURE	54
3. 1. ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi (d. 1452).....	55
3. 2. Qudsi’s Loyalty to his Sheikh Zayn al-Din Khwafi	58
3. 2. 1. Spiritual Stations and Levels (<i>Maqamat wa Maratib</i>) and Cosmological Realms (<i>A‘lam</i>) for Abd al-Latif Qudsi	59
3. 2. 2. <i>Hurufis</i> in Qudsi’s <i>Kashf al-I‘tiqad</i>	62
3. 3. ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi and Ibn ‘Arabi	68
3. 4. Concluding Remarks	72
4. IBN ‘ARABI AS A POLEMICAL FIGURE	77
4. 1. Polemical Clichés of Ibn ‘Arabi	78
4. 1. 1. Oneness of Being (<i>Wahda al-Wujud</i>)	80

4. 1. 2. The Faith of Pharaoh	95
4. 1. 3. Seal of Sainthood (<i>Khatm al-Walaya</i>) and Comparison of Sainthood with Prophethood	99
4. 1. 4. State of Infidels in Hell	103
4. 1. 5. Doctrine of Levels of Existence (<i>Maratib al-Wujud</i>) of Akbari School.	104
4. 2. Concluding Remarks	114
5. ZAYNIYYA IN ANATOLIA: AKBARI ZAYNIS	120
5. 1. Early Ottoman Reception of Ibn ‘Arabi	121
5. 2. Şehabeddin Sivasi (d. 1455)	126
5. 3. Molla Fenari (d. 1431)	135
5. 4. Kutbüddinzade İzniki (d. 1480).....	139
5. 5. Piri Halife Hamidi (d. 1460)	143
5. 6. Sheikh Vefa (d. 1491)	148
5. 6. 1. An Akbari Zayni Sheikh in Istanbul: Sheikh Vefa and Ibn ‘Arabi	154
5. 7. Concluding Remarks	179
6. CONCLUSION	186
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	195

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BEEK: Bursa Yazma ve Eski Basma Eserler Kütüphanesi

DİA: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (online)

FUSUS: Ibn 'Arabi, *Fusus al-Hikam*

FUTUHAT: Ibn 'Arabi, *al-Futuhāt al-Makkiya*

JAZZAB AL-QULUB: Şehabeddin Sivasi, *Jazzab al-Qulub ila Tariq al-Mahbub*

KASHF AL-İ'TİQAD: 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi, *Kashf al-İ'tiqad fī al-Radd 'ala Madhab al-Ilhad*

MANHAJ: Zayn al-Din Khwafi, *Manhaj al-Rashad ra Wasita-i Salah-i İ'tiqad-i 'Ibad*

NAFAHAT: Lami Çelebi, Translation of *Nafahāt al-Uns min Hadarat al-Quds*

RASHAHAT: Muhyi Gülşeni, Translation of *Rashahāt 'Ayn al-Hayat*

RISALA: Kutnüddinzade İzniki, *Risala fī qawl Ibn 'Arabi fī Iman Fir'awn*

RISALA AL-NAJAT: Şehabeddin Sivasi, *Risala al-Najat min Sharr al-Sifat*

SEFINE: Hüseyin Vassaf, *Sefine-i Evliya*

SHAQA'IQ: Ahmed Taşköprizade, *Al-Shaqa'iq al-Nu'maniyya fī 'Ulama al-Dawla al-'Uthmaniyya*

SK: Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi

TUHFA WAHİB: 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi, *Tuhfa Wahib al-Mawahib fī Bayan al-Maqamat wa al-Maratib*

ZUBDAT AL-TAHQIQ: Piri Halife Hamidi, *Zubdat al-Tahqiq wa-Nuzhat al-Tawfiq*

NOTES ON USAGE

1) Arabic, Persian, and Turkish words listed in the **Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary** and **IJMES Word List** appear in this book without italics - hence **Qur'an**, **ulema**, **shah**, **sunna**, **hadith**, **sheikh**, **sharia**, **hajj**, and **madrassa**. However, *Maratib al-Wujud* (*Italics*), *Wahda al-Wujud* (*Italics*).

2) Arabic and Persian terms, texts, and book titles are fully transliterated without macrons and diacritics, except that **hamza** –when it is in the middle of a word – and **ayn** are shown with ' and ' respectively. Thus, *al-Shaqa'iq al-Nu'maniyya*, and *Nafahat*.

3) Plurals of non-English terms use the English plural suffix s (e.g., *hurufis*, *akbaris*, and *Zaynis*).

4) Arabic and Persian personal names are normally fully transliterated – for instance **Zayn al-Din Khwafi**, **'Abd al-Latif Qudsi**, and **Ibn 'Arabi**. However, if the context relates to Ottoman dynasty or if the person lives during the Ottoman age in Anatolia, all personal names appear in their modern Turkish rendering, as in **Molla Fenari**, **Kutbüddinzade** etc.

5) The modern Turkish version of place names is used (e.g., **Konya** and **Bursa**) unless there is an established Anglicized form, as there is for **Istanbul**, **Damascus**, **Samarqand**, **Aleppo**, **Anatolia**, **Herat**, **Khorasan**, and **Transoxiana**.

6) All dates are given according to the **Common Era**. In cases of lunar dates for which the month is not known, the lunar year may extend into two years of the Common Era. Then, the two years are shown with a virgule (/). For example, 1548/49 is given for the lunar year 955.

7) All translations from Qur'an belongs to Abdullah Yusuf Ali (d. 1953) cited from <http://www.islam101.com/quran/yusufAli/>

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. 1. Statement of the Problem and the Argument

Sa'in al-Din Turka (d. 1431) was a prominent Sufi/scholar under Timurid rule. After two interrogations in Herat by Shahrukh (d. 1447), who was the ruler of Timurid State during the age, because of his so-called dangerous ideas, Turka wrote in his *Nafsat al-Masdur-i Awwal*:

Look at the land of Rum. The power of Islam is so strong in the land of Rum that they go to Damascus and Egypt to study, and they reproach them, and they say that the rules of law are stronger in our land, such as that there is no *tamgha*.¹ But, the people of Rum such as Molla Shams al-Din Fanari, who is the Chief Judge there, all studied these sciences and read those books, which they revile here.²

This statement of Turka raises some interesting questions: What were the books and sciences studied by Molla Fenari (d. 1431) and discredited in the lands under Timurid rule? In other words, what was the difference between the intellectual context that Timurid and Ottoman scholars were raised in? Turka's emphasis on the *tamgha* is one clue: according to Turka, the Ottoman state was ruled with sharia only, in contrast to the Timurid state, which implemented the tax of *tamgha*. Turka's mention of Molla Fenari is a second clue: Turka calls him chief judge, and he was indeed one of the most prominent scholars in Ottoman lands during the period. He was also the leading member of Akbari School in Anatolia.

Akbari School is a textual and interpretative community that was built in Anatolia by Sadr al-Din Qunawi (d. 1274). Qunawi and his students are scholars who wrote many commentaries on the works of Ibn 'Arabi and Qunawi. By doing so, they systematized seemingly ambiguous and complex ideas of Ibn 'Arabi. Akbari School has never been

¹ A market tax, which was peculiarly imposed by Turco-Mongol rulers.

² İlker E. Binbaş, "The Anatomy of a Regicide Attempt: Shahrukh, the urūfīs, and the Timurid Intellectuals in 830/1426/27," *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society* (2013): 25.

a classical tariqa since it has no litanies (*awrad*, sing. *wird*³) and lodge. It was institutionalized as an intellectual school but not as a lodge⁴ and first member of this school was Qunawi. He taught courses of *Fusus* and *Futuhat* and trained many students who, in the later period, wrote important commentaries on these books and books of Qunawi. Writing commentaries on books of Akbari Sufis became a tradition afterwards. Akbari School reached Ottoman times and influenced first scholars of Ottoman state greatly, like Davud Kayseri (d. 1350) and Molla Fenari.

When Turka's intellectual inclinations⁵ and his reference to Molla Fenari are considered, it would not be wrong to claim that Turka was referring to a mystical philosophy represented by Ibn 'Arabi and Molla Fenari when he was mentioning the books that are studied in Anatolia and discredited in the Timurid lands. In large part, this thesis is an attempt to find answers to the hard questions above by examining the change that occurred in the ideas of first-generation Zayni dervishes that immigrated to Anatolia and second-generation Zayni dervishes who are mostly Anatolian during the fifteenth century.

Throughout the thesis, I use this conceptualization of first-generation and second-generation Zayni sheikhs. When I am saying first-generation, as I told above, I mean Khwafi's disciples that he sent to Anatolia, more significantly I refer to 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi (d. 1452). When I say second-generation Zayni sheikhs, I refer to the disciples of Khwafi's disciples who lived in Anatolia, more specifically Şehabeddin Sivasi (d. 1455), Molla Fenari (d. 1431), Kutbüddin İzniki (d. 1480), Piri Halife Hamidi (d. 1460), and Sheikh Vefa (d. 1491). The major difference between the first and second

³ Vocal prayers structured as a list of formulaic phrases and sometimes with repeated refrains. Names of God and phrases from the Qur'an frequently punctuate these prayers. Typically referred to with the Arabic terms *hizb* (lit. "section," pl. *ahzab*) and *wird* (lit. "access, coming" pl. *awrad*), they were often composed by famous mystics and handed down as part of the heritage of an order. A given prayer's unique power derived from the sanctity and distinctive spirituality of the one who composed it. Litanies could function as part of the content of communal recollection rituals. Some litanies are kept secret to the extent that they are specially selected and bestowed on a seeker only on full initiation into an order. Litanies performed at the individual's discretion, not necessarily under prescribed circumstances, are called *rawatib* ("things arranged," sg. *ratib*), and some litanies have been available to devout Muslims outside the context of the orders. For this see, John Renard, *The A to Z of Sufism* (Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, 2009), 144.

⁴ Mahmud Erol Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber İbn Arabi Düşüncesine Giriş* (İstanbul: Sufi Kitap, 2017), 79-80.

⁵ Please see Binbaş, "Regicide Attempt," 22-28 for a detailed discussion of these inclinations.

generations is that when Qudsi, who is the only representative of the first-generation in this thesis, raised in outside of Anatolia and carrying religious, intellectual, and political concerns of another context to Anatolia, second-generation Zaynis are Sufis who rose in an Anatolian cultural and intellectual context. This difference is important with respect to our thesis, which will be explained below.

This thesis, from a general perspective, is an inquiry of heresy (*ilhād*). Scholars who study on Islamic intellectual and social history generally ground on a presupposed dichotomy between heresy and orthodoxy. Sometimes this dichotomy plays a dominant role.⁶ The reason for this dichotomy is that studying on intellectual and social history means actually studying the change. In these studies, the dichotomy is adopted to conceptualize this change. Knysh, in this sense, reflects the approach of general modern literature on the subject by saying, “In fact, the development of Muslim societies is often seen as a constant struggle of ‘scripturalist’ Islam against ‘heterodox’ tendencies, often associated with allegedly ‘non-Islamic’ influences.”⁷ Knysh further claims that presupposition of this dichotomy is extensively exploited by Western scholars and they chose to ignore Eurocentric and pro-Christian connotations of the dichotomy.⁸ He gives many examples from the studies that adopt this approach. I will exemplify here the study of a Turkish scholar: Ahmet Yaşar Ocak’s *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler 15-17. Yüzyıllar*.

Ocak traces the meaning of being heretic in the Ottoman society during fifteenth and seventeenth centuries by focusing on the groups who were deemed heretic. In the first pages of his book he claims that he manifests a historical reality: According to Ocak, movements of heresy were started to be seen in the eighth century. Common ground in which these heretical groups met was that none of them were Arabian, which means they were turned into Muslims under the shadow of swords. They had been Muslims superficially but protecting their original beliefs and defended their original belief with the terminology of Islam. This conflict was actually a struggle

⁶ Alexander Knysh, “‘Orthodoxy’ and ‘Heresy’ in Medieval Islam: An Essay in Reassessment,” *The Muslim World* LXXXIII, no. 1 (1993): 48.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

between the conqueror and the conquered. Ocak claims that divergence of these new Muslims from the path of their conquerors was actually a way of resistance. They were trying to protect their original beliefs, ideas, practices, and *weltanschauung* by hiding them in an Islamic color. So, according to Ocak, the literature on heretics developed from refutations of these new heretics.⁹ Ocak here accepts the dichotomy between heterodoxy and orthodoxy, which he maintained throughout the book. From this point of view, he explains the retributions to so-called heretics in Ottoman State results from their non-Islamic ideas and doctrines.

In many studies, including Ocak's book, heresy is the synonym of heterodoxy and reference when mentioning heretical ideas is generally ideas that do not suit to sharia and sunna. The problem in the usage of this dichotomy is that it is accepted as a nonhistorical, timeless, and universal dichotomy by modern scholars. The term of orthodoxy is usually paralleled with conformist Sunnism¹⁰ when heterodoxy is mainly understood as a non-conformist Sufism and Shiism.¹¹ The problem here is that dichotomy between heterodoxy and orthodoxy is a Euro-centric one and do not correspond with the realities in Islamic context. Except from the fact that I have serious doubts on the validity of the dichotomy in the European context, I am sure of its impropriety in the Islamic context.

There had been many sects who were deemed heretic by political and intellectual authorities throughout the Islamic history. My opposition is against accepting the content of this dichotomy universal. I suggest that construction of such a dichotomy between the right and wrong Islam was an on-going process. It is wrong to freeze the content of a dichotomy that was accepted in a certain place and time and to apply it to a wide period of time and geography. One of the most outstanding examples of the historical character of heresy is Bayrami-Malamiyya tariqa in Ottoman State. When some representatives of them were executed in the sixteenth century with the

⁹ Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler 15-17. Yüzyıllar*, (İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2013), 1-3.

¹⁰ Robert Langer and Udo Simon, "The Dynamics of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy. Dealing with Divergence in Muslim Discourses and Islamic Studies," *Die Welt des Islams* 48, no. 3/4 (2008): 274-76.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 285.

accusation of heresy, in the eighteenth century, one Grand Vizier, Şehit Ali Paşa (d. 1716), and one sheikh al-Islam, Seyyid Ali Efendi (d. 1712), were members of the same *tariqa*.¹² It means, in the political, intellectual, and religious context of the sixteenth century they were accepted as heterodox when in the context of the eighteenth century they were accepted as orthodox.

Alexander Knysh proposes the term “orthodoxy-in-the-making” instead.¹³ Different from a timeless and ahistorical notion of “orthodoxy,” the term of “orthodoxy-in-the-making” is amorphous and spontaneous. According to Knysh, this kind of orthodoxy gets on the stage when a vital aspect of religious and political establishment is in danger. By accepting this kind of a term, because of its local and spontaneous character, it would be more possible to understand the real intention of Muslim thinkers of the age on their statements about heretics of their time and place. For example, members of the Malamiyya *tariqa* were heterodox in the sixteenth century but they were orthodox in the eighteenth century. When Muslim scholars were blaming a certain group as heretic they were answering to certain dangers that occurred in specific historical conditions. Thus, “orthodoxy-in-the-making” has a local character. This kind of orthodoxy arose when political and religious authorities viewed a minority group schismatic and dangerous. The important thing here, according to Knysh, is not to project this later model of authentic Islam to earlier ages, because the emergence of the final form of orthodoxy in a given geography and time takes centuries and certain political crises. And this orthodoxy is established mainly with the support of the state. Knysh asserts that scholars who manage to acquire the support of state usually succeeded in suppressing their rivals.¹⁴ So, this thesis is an inquiry into heresy and adopts the approach of Knysh, which is represented by the term “orthodoxy-in-the making.” In this sense, I try to conceptualize the term’s reference to various meanings in different political, religious, and intellectual contexts of Herat and Anatolia.

¹² Ocak, *Zındıklar ve Mülhidler*, 308-309.

¹³ Knysh, “Orthodoxy and Heresy,” 64.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 64-66.

As my main argument, I chose the issue of Ibn 'Arabi, more specifically debates about controversial issues asserted by Ibn 'Arabi. The reason of my prioritization of Ibn 'Arabi is that this issue provides a great tool for examining the changing meaning of the term of heresy. Ibn 'Arabi is most probably the most debated issue in the history of Sufism. Debates around Ibn 'Arabi started when he was still alive and today it is still a subject of debate for both Muslim and non-Muslim scholars. The fifteenth century marks the peak point of debates around Ibn 'Arabi.¹⁵ Critics condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy and infidelity; proponents accept him as the most prominent master (*al-sheikh al-akbar*). Critics highlight certain of Ibn 'Arabi's statements to present him as heretic; proponents respond to these accusations of heresy by explaining the esoteric meaning of these statements. Certain topics became standard titles in the debates about Ibn 'Arabi: the faith of Pharaoh, the seal of sainthood, a comparison of sainthood with prophethood, and the state of infidels in hell. Opponents of Ibn 'Arabi almost always criticized him with the same approach, and defenders of Ibn 'Arabi almost always gave the same responses to these criticisms. So, I used these formulas as benchmarks that shows Zayni sheikhs' attitude toward Ibn 'Arabi and his intellectual inheritance. When investigating these issues, I also discuss the doctrines of Oneness of Being (*wahda al-wujud*) and Levels of Existence (*maratib al-wujud*) of Ibn 'Arabi. These two doctrines were too complex to reduce into cliché formulas, but they are also frequently attacked by prominent figures like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun and used by Zayni sheikhs when asserting their ideas about Ibn 'Arabi and his ideas.

I also explored two issues, related to my main argument, which is heresy is a historical term and should be understood with regard to political, religious, and intellectual contexts of time and space. First of these two supplementary issues is related with *Hurufis*¹⁶ and usage of the science of letters (*'ilm al-huruf*) and the second argument

¹⁵ Alexander D. Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi in the Later Islamic Tradition The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), 201.

¹⁶ An esoteric sectarian tradition founded in Iran during the late 14th century by a Sufi ascetic named Fadl Allah Astarabadi (1340-1394). His early concern with the interpretation of dreams was eventually superseded by an interest in the esoteric meanings of letters of the alphabet, particularly as a vehicle for communicating a distinctive anthropology and prophetology. The underlying theology turns on such concepts as emanation and ongoing process in divine communication. Fadl Allah was executed

is related with problematic statements of Hallaj and Bistami. The reason for including these is that after my examination of the books of Khwafi, Qudsi, and Sheikh Vefa, I saw that they continued the same debate about heresy. A *Hurufi* attempted to kill Shahrukh, who was the ruler of Timurid State. After this regicide attempt, Shahrukh answered with harsh retributions to *Hurufis*. Usage of the science of letters (*'ilm al-huruf*) was enough for punishment. This incident is reflected in Khwafi's book as labeling *Hurufis* as a sect that has heretical ideas. Qudsi, who was among the first-generation of Zaynis, followed his sheikh about the issue and made the term *Hurufi* as a term that refers any kind of heresy including the ones who do not even use the science of letters. The most outstanding figure among the second-generation of Zaynis, Sheikh Vefa, used science of letters in his book, *Saz-i 'Irfan*. As for the second issue, Qudsi blamed certain problematic statements of Hallaj and Bistami for referring to heretical ideas of incarnation (*hulul*) and unification (*ittihadiyya*) and asserted that these statements are identical with polytheist ideas of Christians. Sheikh Vefa praised these statements. Thus, I took the ideas of Zayni sheikhs' about *Hurufis* and Hallaj and Bistami into consideration as benchmarks that show their position toward heresy.

I chose Zayniyya tariqa as case for my thesis since it represents a great tool for my goal of showing the historical and changing character of the term of heresy. Zayniyya was founded in the fifteenth century, the peak point of debates around Ibn 'Arabi. The founder of the tariqa, Zayn al-Din Khwafi, speaks about the problematic issues, which I used as benchmarks. He does not directly condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy; however, he clearly adopts the ideas derived from a long tradition in refuting Ibn 'Arabi and the members of Akbari School. When I am saying a long tradition here, I intend the criticisms of problematic issues about Ibn 'Arabi. Criticisms of Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun became an accepted way of criticizing Ibn 'Arabi and extensively used by scholars of the later age. Khwafi's criticisms followed the same terminology and the same argumentation of them. Khwafi sent many disciples

for his views. The organization spread throughout the Middle East and was particularly influential among the Bektashiya and some Persian Sufi groups, but it never gained large numbers of adherents. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 111-12.

around the Islamic world during his lifetime to expand his tariqa. Among the places they went was Anatolia, the center of the Akbari School, where Ibn 'Arabi was accepted as *al-sheikh al-akbar* by the Sufis of Anatolia. Qudsi was among the sheikhs who went to Anatolia. He adopted Khwafi's approach of Ibn 'Arabi. In his books, he criticized Ibn 'Arabi by using the same problematic titles, which I used here as benchmarks. However, in social relations he showed intimacy toward Akbari figures like Molla Fenari and Qunawi. The second-generation of Zayniyya, who are the Sufis of Anatolia, did not adopt approach of Khawfi and Qudsi toward Ibn 'Arabi. On the contrary, they defended Ibn 'Arabi in the same issues that their masters criticized him.

In this thesis, I try to contextualize the change in the ideas of Zayni dervishes about Ibn 'Arabi. I also examine the change in the approach of Zayni dervishes about certain heretical groups. For this, I make an inquiry about the changing meanings of heresy in different geographies and cultures.

The changing ideas of Zaynis about Ibn 'Arabi and heresy in general also underscores the dynamism of the religious sphere and importance of context in religious matters. Substantial shift that Zayniyya tariqa had undergone within the span of only a few generations shows that Sufis do not only act and think according to strict manners and laws of tariqas but local differences are almost as important as these manners for them. This situation takes us to another important issue in the historiography of Sufism.

In the early periods of studies on Sufism, scholars were generally concerned with ideas of great Sufi sheikhs who lived during the early age of Sufism.¹⁷ These studies were aiming to elaborate poems and theological and doctrinal ideas of Sufi masters like Ibn 'Arabi, Suhrawardi, Qushayri etc. Trimingham's *The Sufi Orders in Islam* marks

¹⁷ John J. Curry, *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought in the Ottoman Empire The Rise of the Halveti Order, 1350-1650* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), 5; Dina Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005), 1.

the starting point of studies on tariqas.¹⁸ Trimingham accepted Sufi tariqas as socioreligious bases of Sufism.¹⁹ By examining Sufi tariqas Trimingham shifted his interest from Great Sufi masters to ordinary members of a tariqa. He explained the word of Sufi as “anyone who believes that it is possible to have direct experience of God and who is prepared to go out of his way to put himself in a state whereby he maybe enabled to do this.”²⁰ Focusing on the ordinary members of Sufi tariqas opened the examination of Sufi tariqas with regard to their social and political aspects. Trimingham’s effort is developed and sustained in 1980s and 1990s. Many studies are published on the Sufi tariqas and in this way field of Sufism has been subject to studies of history and social sciences. From this perspective, Sufi tariqas gained a place in Sufi historiography with respect to their political and social concerns. These concerns are studied by examining intellectual products, material culture, rituals, and fine arts.²¹ They were now subject to historical changes and organizations that have power to change the social and political realities. In this new historiography, studies on Sufism were taking tariqas not only as organizations that have strict boundaries of manners but also subject to change according to historical context. In addition to the main goal of my thesis, it is also a humble contribution to this recently developing historiography of Sufism. In this sense, I examine Zayniyya tariqa by considering the contrasts between two different contexts, Herat and Anatolia. By doing so, I try to show that tariqas are not structures that produce facsimile disciples. Sufis are open to local differences.

1. 2. Literature Review

In this section, I will examine the literature on Zayniyya tariqa. My aim in this section is to show the contribution of my thesis to this literature.

¹⁸ Alexandre Papas, “Toward a New History of Sufism: The Turkish Case,” *History of Religions* 46, no. 1 (August 2006): 82; Le Gall, *A Culture of Sufism*, 1.

¹⁹ Papas, “Toward a New History of Sufism,” 81.

²⁰ J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (London: Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1971), 1.

²¹ Papas, “Toward a New History of Sufism,” 81-82.

The first independent study on the Zayniyya was a 1964 article by Hans Joachim Kissling, *Einiges über den Zejnîje Orden im Osmanischen Reiche*.²² In this article, Kissling discusses the founder of tariqa Zayn al-Din Khwafi, his disciples in Anatolia and their dissemination of Zayniyya in Anatolia. In his inquiry, Kissling explains the lives and books of Zayni disciples, and the process of their affiliation with Zayniyya. Kissling's aim in this article is to find out the reason behind Zayniyya's rapid disappearance in Anatolia when compared with other tariqas. The reason, according to Kissling, was heretical and Shiite-oriented beliefs and practices of Zayniyya. This attitude contradicted with Ottomans' strict Sunni beliefs, and members of Zayniyya thus could not find purchase among the Ottoman sultans or people.

Kissling relied on two main sources: Jami's *Nafahat* and Taşköprizade's *Shaqa'iq*. An astonishing aspect of the article is Kissling's interpretations about the way Taşköprizade speaks of Khwafi and other Zaynis. According to Kissling, Taşköprizade severely criticizes members of Zayniyya and condemns them for heresy. Kissling also asserts that these criticisms arise from the Ottomans' general hatred of Iranians. Another reflection of this hatred is that, according to Kissling, Taşköprizade includes names from the twelve imams when he is giving chain of initiation of Khwafi. Here, I should assert that, I studied both of these sources, *Nafahat* and *Shaqa'iq*. There is no record as mentioned by Kissling in these sources. Taşköprizade never criticizes Khwafi or his followers for heresy, and he never mentions the Iranian origins or Shiism of Zaynis.

This article is actually a great example of an erroneous method in the historiography of Sufism that I mentioned in the previous section. The article shows how big mistakes are possible when this field is approached with biases. Kissling accepts an ahistorical and timeless dichotomy between orthodoxy and heterodoxy. According to him, orthodoxy refers to Sunnism and heterodoxy refers to Shiism. The biggest mistake he made is the anachronism of interpreting his sources according to pre-ordained conclusion. He knows that Zayniyya disappeared faster when compared

²² Hans Joachim Kissling, "Einiges über den Zejnîje Orden im Osmanischen Reiche," *Der Islam* XXXIX (1964).

with other tariqas during the age. And he believes that Ottoman state started to be ruled with Sunni law after a point. So he jumps to the conclusion that if Zayniyya disappeared quickly, the reason behind that must have been Zayniyya's heretical and Shiite-oriented beliefs.

Another problematic part of Kissling's article is that Sheikh Vefa is not mentioned in it. However, Sheikh Vefa is probably the most outstanding Zayni figure in Istanbul whom many bureaucrats and prominent scholars recognized as sheikh. We do not know if Kissling purposely excluded Sheikh Vefa or not. However, he is a figure that contradicts Kissling's main argument as Zaynis never had an impact on Ottoman realm and they were not accepted by Sultans and scholars of Ottoman lands.

Second important study on Zayniyya is Reşat Öngören's *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı Zeyniler*.²³ Öngören's book is a response to Kissling's evaluations of Zayniyya. Like Kissling, Öngören gives wide place to Zayni sheikhs in Anatolia. He also explains the dissemination of Zayniyya in other lands. The book consists of four chapters. In the first chapter, Öngören explains origins of Zayniyya, gives the chain of initiation (*silsila*²⁴), and explains books and ideas of Zayn al-Din Khwafi. In the second chapter Öngören explains the dissemination of Zayniyya, especially in Anatolia. In the third chapter, Öngören clarifies manners and trait of Zayniyya by referring mainly books of Khwafi. In the last chapter, Öngören suggests reasons for loss of influence in Ottoman lands.

Throughout the book, Öngören provides evidence of the Sunni orientation of Zayniyya. For example, it was a rule for Zaynis to complete education in Islamic sciences before entering the tariqa. A record from Aşıkpaşazade's history is important

²³ Reşat Öngören, *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı Zeyniler* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003).

²⁴ Continuity in authority and legitimacy as manifested in stable institutions and organizational structures and expressed as a "chain" (*silsila*) or "tree" (*shajara*, a type of genealogical chart). Virtually every Sufi order has paid considerable attention to maintaining a sense of organizational integrity, tracing its spiritual pedigree back through a succession of major sheikhs as far back as the Prophet himself. These tables of spiritual descent became the Sufi counterpart of the *isnad* (chains of transmitters) that assured the veracity of sayings of the Prophet. The lineage or genealogy enshrines an order's spiritual legacy or inheritance (*wiratha*). For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 144.

in this sense. According to this record, Khwafi's important disciple Qudsi debated with the Safavid Sheikh Cüneyd. In this debate, Cüneyd claimed that the family of Prophet was more important than his other companions. Qudsi rejected this idea by saying that four Sunni schools originated from Prophet's companions. After this argument Qudsi condemned Cüneyd and his followers with unbelief. When Cüneyd was prioritizing family of Prophet Muhammad, he was actually referring to Imamate doctrine of Shiism. And when Qudsi was defending companions of Prophet Muhammad he was referring to Imams of four Sunni sects. Öngören, by quoting this record, shows that Qudsi clearly takes side with Sunnis.

Another argument of the book is that all Zayni sheikhs are also well-educated scholars. In this sense, Zaynis represent the Sufis on the right path by combining sharia and tariqa in a right way. Öngören suggests that this character of Zayni sheikhs corresponded with the attitude of Ottoman sultans related with their inclination of Sunnism. Because of that, many Ottoman bureaucrats became a member of Zayniyya tariqa in Istanbul and Bursa. According to Öngören, Zayniyya became the tariqa of the educated in the Ottoman lands during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Indeed, many scholars of the time became affiliated with the Zayniyya during the period. This argument again is asserted by Öngören to refute Kissling's claim that Zaynis never had an influence in Ottoman lands.

Öngören reserves the conclusion part of the book to explain the loss of influence of Zayniyya tariqa. This chapter is important for Öngören, since Kissling claims that Zaynis lost their influence because they had heretic and Shii oriented ideas. At the start of the chapter, Öngören directly criticizes Kissling and says, "It will be useful to understand how Zayniyya spread to many lands since when the reason for their fast expansion is understood, this approach will shed light on the loss of their influence. Also, this approach will reveal wrongness of German Turkologist Kissling's claims which are asserted without enough knowledge."²⁵ The real reason for Zaynis' loss of influence, according to Öngören, was that during the same age with Zayniyya other

²⁵ Ibid., 195.

Sufi orders started to shine out and Zayniyya got into a kind of competition with them. According to Öngören, Zayniyya lost its influence because tariqas of Naqshbandiyya, Halvetiye, and Bayramiye gained considerable power in Anatolia. Major reason of Zayniyya's loss is Bayazid II's accession to the throne. According to Öngören, Sheikh Vefa supported Cem Sultan in his fight for throne with Bayazid II. When Bayazid II won this fight, high-level officials cut their relation with Sheikh Vefa. Öngören suggests that this is the main reason of Zayniyya's loss of power in Istanbul. Second tariqa that took power from Zayniyya is Naqshbandiyya. According to Öngören, learned class, i.e. students and teachers of madrasas, chose Naqshbandiyya in a point. The reason of this, some improper practices of Zayniyya tariqa, such as dancing and chanting the litanies out loud (*sama*) and their rules about marriage.²⁶ Öngören suggests that, since members of learned class see these practices improper, they chose Naqshbandiyya since in this tariqa litanies are read silently. Öngören's claim appears weak since it is possible to count many members of learned class who approve out loud chanting.

It appears that Öngören followed Trimmingham in his method in his study on Zayniyya. He mentions each prominent Zayni sheikh. After he explains the dissemination of the tariqa, he starts another chapter which he explains the manners and trait of Zayniyya. In this chapter, he mainly gives references to Zayn al-Din Khwafi's books. He draws a picture of the tariqa, as if Khwafi's rules were valid for all Zaynis around the Islamic world. He gives some different interpretations made by various Zayni sheikhs however these lines do not exceed a couple of lines. I do not think that for example the rule about marriage made by Khwafi was valid in Anatolia. Or for example, chanting litanies out loud with dancing was Sheikh Vefa's innovation. Öngören gives place to innovations made by Sheikh Vefa by reserving it a section with the name of Vefaiyye-i Zeyniyye. However, this section is not sufficient and wrongly evaluated. For example, about Akbari tendencies of Sheikh Vefa, Öngören suggests that while Khwafi accepts the doctrine of experiential unity (*wahda al-shuhud*) Sheikh Vefa

²⁶ Explanations about performing audition and chanting litanies out loud will be given in the Chapter 5 of this . About the rules about marriage, Zayn al-Din Khwafi do not recommend Zayni disciples to marry before seeker gained a high level in tariqa. This means Zayni disciples do not marry until a considerable age. For this, see Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 176.

seems to accept the doctrine of oneness of being (*wahda al-wujud*). The problematic side of this claim is seeing the doctrine of experiential unity completely opposite of oneness of being. Debates about discrepancies and similarities of these two doctrines are still ongoing.²⁷ After Öngören explains these two doctrines as separate designs, he says that Khwafi was not strictly against Ibn 'Arabi. By saying that, he explains Sheikh Vefa's Akbari tendency as something that do not have much of significance.

Öngören successfully answers Kissling's claims. However, he draws a picture as if all Zayni sheikhs, independently from contexts of time and geography, strictly followed Khwafi's orders and advices. In my opinion, this is not the case. Sufis were subject to change according to time and different cultures. In this sense, Sheikh Vefa's, and other Anatolian Zaynis' affiliation with Akbari ideas had great significance and made change in the tariqa.

Third study on Zayniyya is Abdurrezzak Tek's *Abdüllatîf Kudsî Hayatı, Eserleri, Görüşleri*.²⁸ The work consists of six chapters including introduction and conclusion. In the introduction, Tek briefly introduces culture of Zayniyya, chain of initiation, and disciples of Zayn al-Din Khwafi. In this section, Tek only mentions Khwafi's disciples in Anatolia. In the first chapter, Qudsi's life, works, and his disciples are explained in detail. Greatest place is given to Qudsi's lodge in Bursa. In this section, Tek introduces all sheikhs of this lodge until 1964. This section is important since it shows that after 1785, tekke in Bursa is administered by sheikhs of other tariqas like Bektaşîye and Halwatiyya.

In the second chapter, Tek explains Qudsi's ideas about Sufism in detail. In the next chapter, he explains Qudsi's theological ideas with the same elaborateness. And in the forth chapter, Tek explains evaluations of Qudsi about education.

In the conclusion part, Tek claims some observation he derived from works of Qudsi. According to Tek, Qudsi is the most important disciple of Khwafi in Anatolia. First, he

²⁷ See; Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 319-22.

²⁸ Abdurrezzak Tek, *Abdüllatîf Kudsî Hayatı, Eserleri ve Görüşleri* (Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2007).

took a good education in Islamic sciences. He possesses great knowledge and terminology of Islamic sciences. Second, Qudsi's main aim in his books was to warn his disciples, students, and people against the dangers of wrong paths within Islam. He frequently referred to verses of Qur'an and hadiths of Prophet Muhammad beside statements of prominent ulema and Sufis who lived before him. Thirdly, according to Tek, Qudsi approaches problematic issues of Sufism with caution. He generally keeps silence about these problematic issues. Tek also suggests that Qudsi, like his sheikh Khwafi, adopted the doctrine of experiential unity and maintains the same cautious attitude toward Ibn 'Arabi and his problematic ideas.

Tek's book is a descriptive study. In this sense, he does not have a riveting argument. However, his study reveals that another figure that influence Qudsi was Imam Ghazzali. Qudsi, in his ideas about Sufism, including Ibn 'Arabi and doctrine of oneness of being, strictly follows his sheikh Khwafi. As Tek suggested, Qudsi never blames Ibn 'Arabi with heresy directly, however, when his evaluations about the sect that he calls *wujudiyan* is examined, we see that he speaks within a long tradition that refutes Ibn 'Arabi and condemns him for heresy. He adopts the terminology of this tradition. In other words, Qudsi indirectly criticizes Ibn 'Arabi. In his ideas about theology, we see that Qudsi strictly adopts Imam Ghazzali's approach. According to Tek, some of Qudsi's books should be evaluated as translation or commentary of Imam Ghazzali's works. In this sense, Tek's book is important since it shows that sheikhs are open to intellectual influence of other scholars and Sufis. Being a member of a tariqa does not necessarily mean strictly adopting the ideas of one's sheikh.

The fourth important study on Zayniyya is Bekir Köle's *Zeynüddîn Hafi ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri*.²⁹ Köle's book consists of five chapters including introduction and conclusion. In the introduction, he gives the general religious, social, and political picture of Khwafi's age. In the first chapter, he explains Khwafi's life and the tariqa of Zayniyya in general. He speaks of his books and dissemination of Zayniyya in Islamic world. In this chapter he gives a wide place to Khwafi's disciples. Among these

²⁹ Bekir Köle, *Zeynüddîn Hâfî ve Tasavvufî Görüşleri* (İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2011).

disciples, he prioritizes Khwafi's disciples in Anatolia. In this chapter, the most important section is the one Köle suggested reasons for Zayniyya's loss of influence. In this section, Köle criticizes Kissling's claim that Zayniyya lost influence because the Ottoman polity got into process of sunnification. However, he agrees with Kissling in his other claims about this loss. In this sense, two reasons claimed by Kissling is true. These are: (1) Khwafi never came to Anatolia in contrast with other tariqa's sheikhs who settled in Anatolia for many years, and (2) there were no sheikhs in Zayniyya during and after Suleiman the Magnificent in contrast with other tariqas.

In the second chapter, Köle explains Khwafi's approach of Sufism. In the third chapter, he tells the daily tasks of Zayni disciples by referring Khwafi's works. In these two chapters, Köle explains Khwafi's ideas by citing statements of other Sufis and ulema together with literature of modern psychology. In this sense, Köle seems to be trying to show that Khwafi's ideas are essential in the general literatures of Sufism and contemporary world. In the conclusion chapter, he mainly summarizes the book. Like Tek's work, Köle's book is a descriptive study and does not include a significant argument.

There is a common deficiency in the literature on Zayniyya, if we exclude Tek's book. These studies do not study Zayniyya tariqa by taking its changed disposition due to different historical, social, cultural, and political contexts of different geographies into consideration. In this sense, they show members of Zayniyya in all places as soldiers of Khwafi who strictly follow him. When they are explaining the manners of Zayniyya they only explain ideas of Khwafi. However, every time and each place has its own particular conditions. For example, Zayniyya in Syria is likely going to be quite different from Zayniyya in Anatolia, even during the same period.

In my thesis, I tried to explain the story in Anatolia by referring Zayni disciples' attitude toward Ibn 'Arabi. Ibn 'Arabi and his intellectual inheritance is one of the major determiners in the intellectual life and political context in Anatolia. I referred Khwafi's ideas about heretics by taking into consideration policies of Shahrukh as the major influence in Khwafi's ideas. Then, I compare them with Zaynis in Anatolia by taking into consideration Ibn 'Arabi, whose ideas were important in the political and

intellectual life in Anatolia. In this sense, I tried to contextualize the change that occurred in the ideas of Zayni disciples in Anatolia.

1. 3. Primary Sources

In my thesis, I tried to evaluate the changes occurred in the ideas and attitudes of Zayni disciples toward Ibn 'Arabi. This kind of inquiry requires two types of sources: the books written by these sheikhs, and the biographical sources that describe their lives. So, in this study, I used nine books that belong to Zayni sheikhs and mainly three biographical sources. I will firstly introduce the sheikhs' books in the order they appear in my thesis. Then, I will briefly mention biographical sources.

1. 3. 1. Books of Zayni Dervishes

I used the books of Zaynis to understand their ideas about Ibn 'Arabi. These books showed that the second-generation of Zaynis had a much different perspective from that of Qudsi and Khwafi. No doubt, there are other books on Sufism, written by these sheikhs. However, the books that will be presented are sufficient to show the main contours of the debate. So I confined myself with them.

a) *Manhaj al-Rashad ra Wasita-i Salah-i l'tiqad-i 'Ibad* (The Way of the True Religion as Means to Welfare of Faith of People) of Zayn al-Din Khwafi: Khwafi wrote *Manhaj* in April 1428, sixteen months after the regicide attempt against Shahrukh. The book is in Persian and consists of forty-five folios. In it, Khwafi defines the concept of heresy and explains the old heretics and the new heretics. By doing so, he states that he aims to protect Muslims against the dangers of heretics. He praises Timur and Shahrukh for their efforts in defeating heretics in Timurid lands. After an attempt on his life, allegedly carried out by *Hurufis*, Shahrukh implemented harsh measures over the learned class in Herat to gain control over the intellectual class. Khwafi's book legitimized this effort, and also gave Khwafi an opportunity to defeat his rivals. The main importance of book comes from Khwafi's evaluations about Ibn 'Arabi and his intellectual inheritance. Khwafi does not condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy. He even asserts that Ibn 'Arabi was among the Sufis of the right path. However, when we examined his claims about a sect he called *wujudiyyan*, we see that Khwafi actually

harshly criticizes the doctrine of oneness of being and its followers. In this sense, *Manhaj* constitutes the first basis of my suggestion of Zayni disciples in Anatolia diverged from their sheikhs in Zayniyya about the attitude toward Ibn ‘Arabi. I chose to include this book because this is the book in which Khwafi reveals his attitude toward Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers. Further explanations about the book, and the bases for my suggestion will be given in Chapter 2. I used the copy in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi collection, number 2829.

b) *Tuhfa Wahib al-Mawahib fi Bayan al-Maqamat wa-l-Maratib* (Gift of Bestower of the Bestowings about Spiritual Stations and Levels) of ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi: *Tuhfa Wahib* is probably one of Qudsi’s earliest books, since his other books contain references to it. This book seems to be the most popular of his books, since it has more translations than his other books and there are more than ten copies in various libraries.³⁰ The book is in Arabic and consists of thirty-one folios.

In *Tuhfa Wahib*, Qudsi explains the stations and levels (*maqamat wa-maratib*) that will be experienced by the spiritual seeker during his journey. He also explains the cosmological realms (*a’lam*) that correspond with each station. This book’s aim is to explain the spiritual journey (*sayr al-suluk*) for disciples. My reason for including the book in this study is to examine the similarities and discrepancies between these doctrines and the Akbari School’s doctrine of levels of existence (*maratib al-wujud*), one of the school’s most famous doctrines. I used the copy in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Halet Efendi collection, number 246.

c) *Kashf al-I’tiqad fi al-Radd ‘ala Madhab al-Ilhad* (Discovery of Faith for Rejecting the Sect of Heresy) of ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi: Qudsi asserts that he finished this book in 1447-48, in Damascus. However, on the margins of the pages where he mentions *Hurufis*, he introduces heretics he met when he is going to Anatolia. So these margins are written during his journey after his departure from Damascus. The book consists of sixty folios and the language of the book is Arabic. The only copy of the book is at the

³⁰ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 47-48.

Bursa Yazma ve Eski Basma Eserler Kütüphanesi (BEEK), general collection, number 1479/5.

This book seems like an extended version of Khwafi's *Manhaj*. Qudsi adopts the same approach as that of his sheikh Khwafi, but he adds more heretic groups. Where Khwafi is counting four sects when he is explaining new heretics, Qudsi counts twenty-one sects, including the ones Khwafi mentioned. The purpose of *Kashf al-I'tiqad* is the same as that of *Manhaj*, warning Muslims against the dangers of heretics. In this book, Qudsi adopts the same attitude with Khwafi toward Ibn 'Arabi. In this sense, *Kashf al-I'tiqad* has a major significance with respect to aim of my study.

d) *Risala al-Najat min Sharr al-Sifat* (Book of Salvation from the Bad Attributes) of Şehabeddin Sivasi: *Risala al-Najat* is a glossary of Sufi terminology. In this book, Sivasi counts general terms used by Sufis. In this book, Sivasi addresses a general audience. Sivasi's aim is to show the ways in which Sufis can free themselves from their bad attributes.

The work consists of nineteen folios and the language of the book is Arabic. I used the copy in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Halet Efendi collection, number 246. I included the book into this study because it is one of Sivasi's two books on Sufism. In his other book, *Jazzab al-Qulub*, Sivasi includes Ibn 'Arabi in his chain of initiation. It was important to understand if there was any further references to Ibn 'Arabi or Akbari School.

e) *Jazzab al-Qulub ila Tariq al-Mahbub* (Attraction of Hearts to the Way of the Beloved) of Şehabeddin Sivasi: *Jazzab al-Qulub* is Sivasi's second book on Sufism. Like the first one, Sivasi explains terms of Sufism in this book, too. And like the first one, he addresses a general audience. There is no special reference to Zayniyya in this book.

The book consists of eight folios and is in Arabic. The importance of this book for the present study is that Sivasi debates two issues related with Ibn 'Arabi. First, he includes Ibn 'Arabi in his chain of initiation, and, second he debates about the

differences between prophets and saints. As will be seen in the Chapter 4, this comparison is an important issue in Ibn 'Arabi's work. I used the copy in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Hacı Mahmud Efendi collection, number 3255.

f) *Zubdat al-Tahqiq wa-Nuzhat al-Tawfiq* (Essence of Inquiry and Joy of Success) of Piri Halife Hamidi: Piri Halife's *Zubdat al-Tahqiq* is a commentary on Qunawi's famous *al-Nusus fi Tahqiq al-Tawr al-Makhsus*. Piri Halife aims to explain complicated issues in *Nusus*. This book is important for this study since Piri Halife, as a Zayni sheikh in Anatolia, wrote a commentary on the book of Ibn 'Arabi's most important student. Piri Halife also indicates that he used to teach lessons on *Nusus* to his students. These two practices, commentary on *Nusus* and making lessons of it are enough to prove that Piri Halife as a Zayni sheikh was also a member of the Akbari School in Anatolia. I examined this commentary to understand the position of Piri Halife about the problematic issues related with Ibn 'Arabi.

The book consists of 174 folios and the language of the book is Arabic. I used the copy in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ayasofya collection, number 4805.

g) *Risala fi Qawl Ibn 'Arabi fi Iman Fir'awn* (Book on the Statement of Ibn 'Arabi about the Faith of Pharaoh) of Kutbüddinzade İzniki: İzniki asserts that he wrote this book to clarify two problematic issues related with Ibn 'Arabi: the faith of Pharaoh and state of infidels in hell. However, in the introduction, he says that this is not the time for talking about the issue of faith of Pharaoh. So, he mainly speaks of the issue of state of infidels in hell. These two issues are problematic issues debated mainly to show one's position toward Ibn 'Arabi as follower or detractor. As an interesting aspect of this book, İzniki, as a Zayni disciple whose affiliation with Akbari School is certain, does not agree with Ibn 'Arabi on the issue of the faith of Pharaoh.

This is a short book consisting of four folios and its language is Arabic. I used the copy in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ragıp Paşa collection, number 692. I chose to use this copy because notes on the margins of this copy were written by İzniki.

h) *Saz-i 'Irfan* (Instrument of Mystical Knowledge) of Sheikh Vefa: *Saz-i 'Irfan* is one of the most important books included in this study. In this book, Sheikh Vefa directly shows his positive ideas about Ibn 'Arabi and the Akbari School. What is more, Sheikh Vefa explains the Akbari School's doctrine of the levels of existence by following Qunawi's pattern, which is named as five divine presences (*hazarat al-khams*). Furthermore, he explicitly adopts the statements Bayazid Bistami asserted during the state of ecstasy, which Qudsi condemned as heretical in his *Kashf al-I'tiqad*. Sheikh Vefa also uses the science of letters in this book. As will be detailed, *Hurufis* and usage of this science were also condemned as heresy by Qudsi.

Saz-i 'Irfan is a long poetry book of Sheikh Vefa and consists of 372 couplets and 145 quatrains. The language of the book is Ottoman Turkish. I use the transliteration of *Saz-i 'Irfan* offered by Avni Erdemir in his PhD dissertation.³¹

i) *Makam-i Suluk* (Level of the Spiritual Journey) of Sheikh Vefa: *Makam-i Suluk* is Sheikh Vefa's other poetry book. In this book, Sheikh Vefa explains the stations that the spiritual seeker will experience during his journey. Sheikh Vefa counts seven stations. This is a general pattern used by Sufis to explain the stations. In this sense, it has no relation with Ibn 'Arabi's pattern or those of Khwafi and Qudsi. However, there are other references in the book that show Sheikh Vefa's intimacy with Ibn 'Arabi.

Makam-i Suluk consists of 297 couplets and seven chapters. In each chapter, Sheikh Vefa explains a station. The language of the book is Ottoman Turkish. I used Erdemir's transliteration in his PhD dissertation.³²

1. 3. 2. Biographical Sources

In my study, I also wish to examine the attitudes of these sheikhs toward Akbari figures and problematic issues about Ibn 'Arabi. To this end, I use biographical sources that speak of these sheikhs. About some issues, I found significant

³¹ Avni Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa İbn Vefâ Hayatı, Eserleri, Tesirleri ve Manzum Eserlerinin Tenkidli Metni" (PhD diss., Gazi Üniversitesi, 1999), 214-87.

³² Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 290-315.

information about their attitude. For example, I found the position of Sheikh Vefa about the issue of faith of Pharaoh in *Nafahat*. In my thesis, I frequently referred to biographical sources. Biographical sources I used are *al-Shaqa'iq al-Nu'maniyya fi 'Ulama al-Dawla al-'Uthmaniyya* of Ahmed Taşköprizade (d. 1561), Lami Çelebi's (d. 1532) translation of *Nafahat al-Uns min Hadarat al-Quds* of Molla Jami, Muhyi-i Gülşeni's (d. after 1608) translation of *Rashahat 'Ayn al-Hayat* of Fahr al-Din 'Ali b. Husayn Kashifi, and *Sefine-i Evliya* of Osmanzade Hüseyin Vassaf.³³

³³ Ahmed Taşköprizade, *al-Shaqa'iq al-Nu'maniyya fi 'Ulama al-Dawla al-'Uthmaniyya*, ed. Ahmed Subhi Furat (İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1985); Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat al-Uns min Hadharati al-Quds*, ed. Süleyman Uludağ (İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları); Muhyî-i Gülşenî, *Reşehât-ı Muhyî Reşehât-ı 'Aynü'l-Hayat Tercümesi*, ed. Mustafa Koç et al. (İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2014); Osmânzâde Hüseyin Vassaf, *Sefine-i Evliya*, ed. Mehmet Akkuş, and Ali Yılmaz (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2015).

CHAPTER 2

ZAYN AL-DIN KHWAFI AND HIS IDEAS ABOUT THE RELIGIOUS LANDSCAPE OF HIS TIME

The main focus of this chapter is Khwafi's engagement with Ibn 'Arabi's Sufi thought. As source, I followed Khwafi's *Manhaj al-Rashad ra Wasita-i Salah-i I'tiqad-i 'Ibad*, Muhyi Gülşeni's (d. after 1608) translation of *Rashahat 'Ayn al-Hayat*, and Lami Çelebi's (d. 1532) translation of *Nafahat al-Uns*. The main argument of this chapter is that Khwafi does not directly label Ibn 'Arabi as a heretic but rather that he implies Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of "Oneness of Being" (*Wahda al-Wujud*)³⁴ as potentially leading to heresy and in this implication, he uses the same argumentation and same terminology with prominent scholars of the earlier age, such as Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun who refute Ibn 'Arabi. In this sense, Khwafi speaks within an anti-Ibn 'Arabi tradition.

I will give wide coverage to Shahrukh's policies in the first section as I argue in this chapter that in *Manhaj*, the definition of heresy is not only a religious demarcation but also a political one. In the second section I will show that, groups who are deemed heretics are also the groups who constitute a political threat for Shahrukh.

2. 1. The Question of the Sunnification Project of Shahrukh

The *muhtasib*³⁵ of Shahrukh, Jalal al-Din Qayini, commemorates Shahrukh in his *Nasa'ih-i Shahrukhi* as, "the protector of the precincts of the faith," "the architect of the palace of Islam," "the huma-bird guarding the egg of the sharia," and "the one

³⁴ *Wahda al-wujud* refers to the doctrine that the individuality of the mystic is ultimately annihilated in the being of God. Developing this doctrine, elaborated most prominently by Ibn 'Arabi, some Sufis adopted the metaphor of drop losing itself completely in the ocean of divine unity. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 245.

³⁵ *Muhtasib*, in the Islamic states, is the person who is in charge of inspecting marketplaces and protecting public moral and order. See the article of "Hisbe" in *DIA* for a wide terminological and historical discussion of the term.

who has obliterated the practices of infidelity and heresy and established the laws of rectitude and rightful guidance.”³⁶

Shahrukh, after conquering the lands of Azerbaijan, became the recognized ruler of the whole of the realm that had come under Timur’s rule when he reached Herat on 17 October 1421.³⁷ His reign as the ruler of these lands lasted for forty-three years. During his reign, Shahrukh made important changes with respect to the bases of power. Because of these changes, it is often suggested that Shahrukh was carrying out a Sunnification project.³⁸ He abrogated the Chinggisid law, implemented sharia, and demolished the influence of all non-Sunni movements.

This suggestion seems accurate when the fundamental changes that took place during Shahrukh’s age are examined. He transferred the Timurid capital from Samargand to Herat, which he called “the dome of Islam” in 1409. This transfer embodies the shift in focus from Transoxiana to Khorasan as the center of Islamic law, learning, and piety.

Shahrukh also announced that he abandoned the Turko-Mongolian law and restored the sharia in 1411. Qayini testifies to this change, as does a letter Shahrukh wrote to the Chinese emperor of the age, in which he stated that he had abolished the Chinggisid law and promulgated the sharia. He is reported to have poured out the wines in drinking dens as a manifestation of this shift. Shahrukh also issued coinage in Herat in his name, on the surface of which “may Allah perpetuate his caliphate” was written.³⁹ Another striking change Shahrukh made was his orders for his father Timur’s tomb. When he captured Samargand in 1409, he visited his father’s tomb

³⁶ Jalal al-Din Qayini, “Nasa’ih-i Shakhruhi,” MS Cod. A.F. 112, Nationalbibliothek, Vienna, fol. 2a, quoted in Maria Eva Subtelny and Anas B. Khalidov, “The curriculum of Islamic Higher Learning in Timurid Iran in the Light of the Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115 (1995): 212.

³⁷ Beatrice Forbes Manz, *Power, Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran* (New York: Cambridge, 2010), 35.

³⁸ Musa Şamil Yüksel, “Şahruh’un Sünni Canlandırma Siyaseti,” *Tarih Okulu* 5 (2009): 95; Subtelny and Khalidov, “Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh,” 210.

³⁹ Subtelny and Khalidov, “Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh,” 211-12; Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 211; Zeki Velidi Togan, “Büyük Türk Hükümdarı Şahruh,” *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 2-3 (1949): 524.

and ordered the removal of Timur's clothes, guns, and belongings from there. Their presence was a Turko-Mongolian custom, in place of which Shahrukh ordered the reciting of the Qur'an in the tomb.⁴⁰

The most obvious and efficient steps Shahrukh took in this regard may be his patronage of a madrasa and his efforts to send Sunni scholars to the non-Sunni lands under his administration in order to convert people there.

In 1415-16, Shahrukh sent an important figure, his *muhtasib* Qayini, to his native land of Quhistan as a proselytizer. Quhistan was a place where the influence of the Nizari Isma'ili sect was highly prominent. The mission of Qayini was to revive the sharia in those mountains.⁴¹ Besides Qayini, Shahrukh sent another *muhtasib*, Shihab al-Din Abu Makarim (d. 1429-30) to India, and Sufi sheikh Husayn Khwarizmi (d. 839/1435-36) to Dasht-i Qipchak with a similar mission.⁴²

The construction of a madrasa-*khanqah*⁴³ complex in Herat in 1410-11 was another important step Shahrukh took. As the endower, Shahrukh gave himself the right to appoint professors there. For the curriculum of the madrasa, Sunni-oriented Islamic sciences were adopted, such as Islamic law, exegesis of Qur'an, and hadith. Shahrukh chose four prominent scholars who belonged to the Hanafi and Shafi schools of Sunni Islamic law as professors for the madrasa. These were, respectively, Jalal al-Din Yusuf Awbahi (d. 1430), Jalal al-Din Yusuf Hallaj (d. 1420), Nizam al-Din 'Abd al-Rahim-i Yar-Ahmad (d. 1425), and Nasir al-Din Lutfullah-i Khwaja 'Azizullah (d.1420).⁴⁴ Subtelny

⁴⁰ Yüksel, "Canlandırma Siyaseti," 100.

⁴¹ Subtelny and Khalidov, "Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh," 218.

⁴² Yüksel, "Canlandırma Siyaseti," 101.

⁴³ Residential Facility. Accommodations for members of formal and generally stable Sufi orders, including their administrative personnel, as well as for itinerant dervishes. Known most commonly by the terms *ribat* (used across a wide geographical area) and *zawiya* (mostly western), *khanqah* (mostly eastern), and *tekke* (Arabic, Persian, and Turkish, respectively), often extensive institutions have developed around original Sufi foundations and their branches as well as around tombs of famous sheikhs. Larger complexes were typically sustained through endowments. The *ribat* was originally a frontier fortress in which warriors took shelter while expanding Islamic rule, and eventually came to be thought of, metaphorically, as a residence for ascetics and others engaged in the inner *jihad*. During medieval times, most such facilities were located in cities rather than in frontier regions. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 200.

⁴⁴ Subtelny and Khalidov, "Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh," 212-13; Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 216-17.

and Khalidov see these appointments as part of a Sunnification project, because these four were Sunni scholars and their assignment to the post was an act against the influence of Shi'i and heterodox movements. Shahrukh himself attended the ceremony of the professors' installment together with two of his leading amirs, Amir 'Aliqa Kukaltash and Amir Firuzshah. According to Subtelny and Khalidov, the attendance of the highest figures of the bureaucracy shows the importance Shahrukh gave to the sunnification project.⁴⁵ Another historian Manz, who specializes in Timurid state, however, disagrees. According to her, the information available about these four figures is insufficient to make such a suggestion. She suggests that Shahrukh was not promoting a specific plan or program when he appointed these professors. Instead, he simply chose among the available and obvious candidates. Figures chosen for such prominent posts were usually either scholars who were local or else who had studied with prestigious scholars from Herat or Samarqand.⁴⁶

The literary tendencies of Awbahi, one of Shahrukh's appointees, seem to give weight to Manz's view.⁴⁷ Khalidov and Subtelny build a highly problematic framework in their article, "Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh," which posits that Sunnism, Shi'ism, and Sufism were entirely separate positions. They also interpret Shahrukh's main goal as a struggle against a type of Sufism, which was highly affected by Shi'i and heterodox movements. But Awbahi was a devotee of Qasim al-Anwar who was a problematic figure in Herat and famous for his extreme interpretations of the ideas of Ibn 'Arabi. He was also deported from Herat after the assassination attempt on Shahrukh, which was carried out by the members of the sect of *Hurufiyya*⁴⁸. Awbahi's devotion to Qasim al-Anwar should thus have been a problem, if distinctions between Sunnism, Shi'ism, and Sufism were as solid as Subtelny and Khalidov liked us to believe and if

⁴⁵ Subtelny and Khalidov, "Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh," 213.

⁴⁶ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 218.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 217.

⁴⁸ An esoteric sectarian tradition founded in Iran during the late 14th century by a Sufi ascetic named Fadl Allah Astarabadi (1340-1394). His early concern with the interpretation of dreams was eventually superseded by an interest in the esoteric meanings of letters of the alphabet, particularly as a vehicle for communicating a distinctive anthropology and prophetology. The underlying theology turns on such concepts as emanation and ongoing process in divine communication. Fadl Allah was executed for his views. The organization spread throughout the Middle East and was particularly influential among the Bektashiya and some Persian Sufi groups, but it never gained large numbers of adherents. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 111-12.

Shahrukh indeed had a solid and specific sunnification project. Khalidov and Subtelny chose not to mention this aspect of Awbahi.

Another assertion as regards Shahrukh's sunnification project is his veneration and patronage of certain shrines.⁴⁹ The most conspicuous shrine Shahrukh patronized was the tomb of 'Abdullah Ansari (d. 1089), a famous Sufi and a Hanbali hadith scholar known as "*pir* of Herat." The Hanbali sect is distinguished from other Sunni sects by its approach to innovation and its strictness and intolerance. Prominent scholars of the Hanbali School were recognized as people of hadith and accordingly it is reported that Ansari memorized 300,000 hadiths.⁵⁰ Ansari was also known as the protector of Herat. His Sufi affiliation and stern condemnation of heretical innovative beliefs make him an appropriate choice for Shahrukh in his Sunni program.⁵¹

Subtelny and Khalidov see Shahrukh's resuscitation of the tomb of Ansari as an ideological touchstone for his Islamicizing policies. According to the framework they build in their article, these policies include opposition to the extremist beliefs that are "an amalgam of Shi'ism and Sufi ideas with a messianism."⁵² I agree with them that Shahrukh stood against extremist movements. However, it would not be accurate to assert that Shahrukh's intention was a purely religious program mainly built against so-called heterodox movements influenced by Shi'ism. There are two reasons for my objection. First, it is an anachronism to underscore Shi'i beliefs like pro-Alidism as the main reason for heretical Sufi oriented movements. Love for the *ahl al-bayt*,⁵³ especially Ali b. Abi Talib, and respect for the twelve imams was seen among non-heretic Sufi groups, too.⁵⁴ Also, beside the shrine of Ansari, Shahrukh's wife Gawharshad patronized the tomb of the eighth imam Rida at Mashhad.

⁴⁹ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 219; Maria E. Subtelny, *Timurids in Transition Turko-Persian Politics and Acculturation in Medieval Iran* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 196; Subtelny and Khalidov, "Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh," 212.

⁵⁰ Yüksel, "Canlandırma Siyaseti," 101-102.

⁵¹ Subtelny, *Timurids in Transition*, 197.

⁵² Subtelny and Khalidov, "Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh," 212.

⁵³ A term that refers to family of Prophet Muhammad. It means people of house. See the article of "ehl-i beyt" in *DĀ* for further information.

⁵⁴ For example, chains of initiation of major Sufi orders like Naqshbandiyya, Khalwatiyya, and Qadiriyya incorporate some of the twelve imams.

Shahrukh also built a madrasa and contributed waqf and gifts to the shrine, which he visited frequently. Visiting the shrines of Muslim saints, including the twelve imams, was a common custom at the time.⁵⁵ Shahrukh does not appear to have distinguished between the tombs of Ansari and Imam Rida in terms of the importance he placed on them. Therefore, it would be wrong to assert that a pure sectarian program like sunnification was introduced by Shahrukh. He rather seems to have manifested a Muslim image to gain legitimacy, first in the eyes of prominent religious figures, then, in the eyes of public.

The second issue that contradicts the suggestion of such a sunnification program is that Shahrukh did not abrogate the Chinggisid law entirely. A famous scholar and historian of the period, Ibn 'Arabshah, in his *'Aja'ib al-Maqdur*, reflects his suspicion about Shahrukh's promotion of sharia and abrogation of Chingissid law. According to Ibn 'Arabshah, if Shahrukh had made such a proclamation, his military elite would have fiercely opposed it.⁵⁶ During Shahrukh's reign, sharia stayed in force alongside the Chingissid law. The case of Amir Firuzshah is famous in this respect. In 1444, Shahrukh summons Firuzshah because of a corrupt behavior and furiously asks him, "Is this the custom?" Shahrukh also discharges one of his princes from the post of governorship because of the "violation of Chingissid law."⁵⁷ During Shahrukh's reign, Mongol taxes always remained in force, as did the Turco-Mongolian court.⁵⁸ As a remarkable case, the consumption of horsemeat and fermented mare's milk (*qimiz*) is justified by the jurists of the age. The explanation for this is that Altaic peoples used to consume these two foods and the military personnel of Shahrukh used to come mainly from this ethnicity.⁵⁹ If Shahrukh's intention had purely been a program to revive sharia, it would have been necessary for him to abolish Chingissid law completely. On the contrary, he explained his attitude toward sharia as a continuation of the attitude of Mongolian leader Ilkhan Ghazan Khan (d. 1304).⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 220.

⁵⁶ Subtelny, *Timurids in Transition*, 26.

⁵⁷ Togan, "Büyük Türk Hükümdarı," 527.

⁵⁸ Beatrice Forbes Manz. "Shāh Rukh." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, second edition. Edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Brill Online, 2016.

⁵⁹ Subtelny, *Timurids in Transition*, 27.

⁶⁰ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 209.

Therefore, it would be more accurate to say that Shahrukh pursued a dual policy. He showed his loyalty to sharia and tried to gain legitimacy in the eyes of Muslim scholars while also showing his respect toward Turco-Mongol custom to gain legitimacy in the eyes of his military elite. However, this does not mean that Shahrukh was not sincere in his deeds for the sake of sharia.

The historians of Shahrukh's age, like Taj al-Salmani and 'Abd al-Razzaq Samarqandi describe him as a religious person. It is said that Shahrukh never missed daily prayers. He always used to visit holy places on his way when he left Herat for a campaign or hunting. He used to fast every first, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth days of the month and on the nights of Mondays, Thursdays, and Fridays; Qur'an readers used to recite Qur'an in the palace with Shahrukh's order. He used to avoid any kinds of games, entertainments, or religiously suspicious activities.⁶¹

During the reign of Shahrukh, there was a balanced relation between religious groups and the ruler. Shahrukh was able to support particular religious groups and individuals. Also, as the ruler, it was his duty to protect sharia and the public order. The religious elite used to demand this duty.⁶² In addition, he intervened in the conflicts of different religious groups. When we examine the conflicts between scholars and Sufis, we see that there was a certain friction between. On occasion, the religious elite used to ask Shahrukh to intervene as an arbiter. Because of the image of Shahrukh as a religious ruler, in such cases, he used to interrogate suspicious figures. There are many historical records that tell the story of these interrogations. For example, a group of religious elites complained to Shahrukh about Sheikh Khwarazmi because of his opinions close to Ibn 'Arabi's idea of the oneness of being. Shahrukh called Sheikh Khwarazmi to his palace and interrogated him. In these interrogations, Shahrukh's treatment was not harsh.⁶³

⁶¹ İsmail Aka, *Mirza Şahruh ve Zamanı (1405-1447)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994), 183.

⁶² Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 208

⁶³ Ibid., 238-39.

However, the religious elite in general liked to avoid being in a close relationship with the ruler. They tried to protect their power by not approaching worldly power. Manz explains the position of the religious elite as follows: "They faced the choice between losing their reputation for disinterestedness if they fully accepted the ruler's bounty, and losing their ability to function usefully as educators and protectors of the population if they removed themselves entirely from the worldly sphere."⁶⁴ Members of the religious elite who did not get close with the ruler were subject to praise. Surprisingly, scholars and sheikhs who rejected positions in the service of the state and who did not accept presents were mentioned with praise in the books dedicated to the members of the ruling class. For example, Shahrukh upheld opinions of a scholar who tenaciously rejected taking an official post.⁶⁵

Manz explains this situation by saying "religious authority was diffuse and amorphous."⁶⁶ This is true only to a certain point. When a religious group started to threaten the political power -i.e., Shahrukh and his administration,- Shahrukh's response was not as peaceful as it had been with Khwarazmi. In such cases, the religious class provided a legitimate basis for the harsh actions of Shahrukh.

During the reign of Shahrukh, we see two religious groups are confronted with serious retributions: the *Nurbakhshiyya* Sufi order and the *Hurufis*.

Nurbakhshiyya was an order attached to the *Kubrawiyya* Sufi order. In 1423-24, *Kubrawi* sheikh Ishaq Khuttalani declared his disciple Sayyid Muhammad Nurbakhsh to be the Mahdi and placed him in a fortress in Khuttalan. One of the disciples of Ishaq Khuttalani dreamed that a divine light fell upon the head of Muhammad Nurbakhsh and spread around the world. The name "Nurbakhsh"⁶⁷ was given to him after this dream. However, Sayyid 'Abd Allah Barzishabadi, another disciple of sheikh Khuttalani, also declared himself as Mahdi. According to historical sources written by the faction of Barzishabadi, Sheikh Khuttalani accepted Muhammad Nurbakhsh's

⁶⁴ Ibid., 195.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 196.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 208.

⁶⁷ *Nurbakhsh* is Persian and means illuminating.

Mahdi-ship reluctantly. This separation within the order led to a political controversy between the followers of Nurbakhsh and Barzishabadi. The result of this controversy could have been serious. Also, the rumor spread that the followers of Nurbakhsh were going to carry out a rebellion. When Shahrukh heard about the incident, he immediately sent his troops to Khuttalan, brought those responsible to Herat, and executed Sheikh Khuttalani. Muhammad Nurbakhsh was sent to Shiraz. After a period of imprisonment he was released under the condition that he renounced his claim that he was the Mahdi. However, he recommenced his activities in Luristan within a year. He struck his own coins and had khutba read in his own name. Shahrukh imprisoned Nurbakhsh again in 1434-35.⁶⁸

Two modern scholars who have studied this case, Devin DeWeese and Shahzad Bashir, suggest that the severe response of Shahrukh was the result of political factors.⁶⁹ Bashir also suggests that Shahrukh saw himself as the patron of true religion, which made religious pretenders such as Nurbakhsh ideologically intolerable.⁷⁰ However, until the possibility of a civil war or the rumor of rebellion arose, Shahrukh did not send his army to Khuttalan. It was only after the danger of disruption of the public order and the problem of legitimacy that Shahrukh decided to send his army.

On 22 January 1427, Shahrukh faced another problem, and this time it was a direct threat. Ahmad-i Lur, a member of the sect of *Hurufiyya* attempted to kill Shahrukh when he was leaving the mosque after the Friday prayer. The attempt was unsuccessful and Shahrukh survived the attack. Ahmad-i Lur was killed on the spot.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 240-41.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 240.

⁷⁰ Shahzad Bashir, *Messianic Hopes and Mystical Visions: The Nurbakhshīya Between Medieval and Modern Islam* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 65.

⁷¹ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 241; Aka, *Mirza Şahruh*, 138; Binbaş, "Regicide Attempt," 1. As an important incident, after the regicide attempt, Shahrukh wanted to be carried in a litter to his palace. However, amir Firuzshah rejected his request and said, "If they carry you in a litter, people will be suspicious about your health. They will think you are dead and anarchy will occur." Shahrukh accepted his rejection and rode to his palace atop his horse. For this, see Aka, *Mirza Şahruh*, 138.

Shahrukh's reaction was ruthless. He started an investigation about the regicide attempt and consequently many Sufis who used the science of letters (*'ilm al-huruf*) were executed, banished, or imprisoned, regardless of whether they were involved with the sect of *Hurufiyya* or not. Qasim al-Anwar is an important example in this manner. He had no connection with the *Hurufis*, however, after the investigations, he was exiled from Herat with the accusation that he had sympathy for the ideas of the *Hurufis*. A later historian Gazurgahi (d.1503-04) says in his *Majalis al-'Ushshaq* that two sayyids, from Herat, were also blamed for the regicide attempt. Amir Makhtum Nishaburi was one of these sayyids and was punished by having hot oil poured on his head.⁷² Another historian, Hafiz-i Abru, names the *Hurufis* as "the fighters for blasphemy and heretics in nature." Hafiz-i Abru does not mention the names of these *Hurufis*, but says that they were interrogated, tortured, and executed after they confessed their link to the assassination.⁷³ The regicide attempt damaged the image and authority of Shahrukh. After the incident, he canceled the taxes and distributed plenty of zakat to the public to restore his authority.⁷⁴ The regicide attempt was a direct threat to the authority of Shahrukh. Like the case of *Nurbakhshiyya*, Shahrukh did not hesitate to take action against the perpetrators and others whose link to the assassination was ambiguous.

Ertuğrul Ökten points out the necessity of re-examining the suggestion that a religious program was pursued by Shahrukh. He says, "Before labeling Shahrukh as the reviver of the sharia it is necessary to see that some of the actions he took can be evaluated in a different light."⁷⁵ In the cases mentioned above, the main concern of Shahrukh was not the heresy or heterodoxy of Sheikh Khuttalani, Muhammed Nurbakhsh, or the *Hurufis*. But for him to be able to punish leaders and members of a religious group, it was necessary for him to attack as the "patron of true religion." In order to take such harsh actions Shahrukh needed the support of the religious class. In the cases of punishment of *Hurufis*, *Nurbakhshis*, and the exile of Qasim al-

⁷² Binbaş, "Regicide Attempt," 13.

⁷³ Ibid., 10.

⁷⁴ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 42.

⁷⁵ Ertuğrul İ. Ökten, "Jāmī (817-898/1414-1492): His Biography and Intellectual Influence in Herat" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2007), 51.

Anwar, Zayn al-Din Khwafi (d.1435), a prominent sheikh in Herat, played a supportive role by legitimating the punishments Shahrukh meted out.

2. 2. Zayn al-Din Khwafi (d. 1435)

Under the rule of Shahrukh, Herat became a center of attraction for people interested in both the exoteric sciences and Sufism. Several sheikhs from prominent tariqas settled in Herat and chose the city as center for their activities. Sheikhs from four tariqas stand out in particular. These are, respectively, Zayn al-Din Khwafi from the *Suhrawardiyya* order, Qasim al-Anwar from the *Safawid* order, Baha al-Din 'Umar from the *Kubrawiyya* order, and great sheikhs like Khwaja Ahrar and Muhammad Parsa from the *Naqshbandiyya* order.⁷⁶ For Qasim al-Anwar, it is suggested that he was also affiliated with the *Suhrawardiyya* order.⁷⁷ All of these names had international reputation. However rivalry between Zayn al-Din Khwafi and Qasim al-Anwar was famous.⁷⁸

Zayn al-Din Khwafi was the founder of the *Zayniyya* tariqa. *Zayniyya* is a Sufi order attached to *Suhrawardiyya*. Khwafi's sheikh was Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman Misri. Sahawi gives full name of Khwafi as follows, Zayn al-Din Abu Bakr Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Ali Abu Bakr al-Khwafi al-Harawi al-Hanafi.⁷⁹ Khwafi gives his name as above with small differences in his various books.⁸⁰

Khwafi was born on 19 March 1356 in the city of Khwaf in the region of Khorasan. He died in Herat on 1 May 1435 in a plague epidemic.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 228.

⁷⁷ Necdet Tosun, "Timur ve Timurluların Tasavvuf Ehli ile Münasebetleri," in *Ölümünün 600. Yılında Emir Timur ve Mirası Uluslararası Sempozyumu*, ed. Doç. Dr. Abdulvahap Kara et al. (İstanbul: Doğu Kütüphanesi, 2007), 415.

⁷⁸ Ottoman Sheikh Akşemseddin's story is significant in this regard. Shortly, Akşemseddin departed for Herat to affiliate with Khwafi whose reputation reached Anatolia. However, he turned back because of a dream he saw in which he understands that his sheikh is actually Hacı Bayram Veli. For this, see biography of Akşemseddin from *Shaqa'iq*.

⁷⁹ Shams al-Din Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman al-Sahawi, *al-Daw'u al-Lami'*, vol. 9, (Beyrut: Daru Mektebeti'l-Hayat), 260.

⁸⁰ Köle, *Zeynüddîn*, 26.

Zayn al-Din Khwafi received a decent education in the field of the Islamic sciences. For education, he traveled to many Islamic intellectual centers of the age, like Transoxiana, Iraq, Azerbaijan, Damascus, Egypt, Hejaz, and Jerusalem. On his journeys, he met many great sheikhs and scholars. He took courses from scholars like Ibn al-Jazari (d.1429), Jalal al-Din Fadl Allah Tabrizi, Shihab al-Din Sayrami, and Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413). He also met important sheikhs like Shihab al-Din Bistami, Zayn al-Din Taybadi (d.1389), Shihab al-Din Ahmad Ghaznawi. Khwafi was trained in the Sufi way by them, but accepted none of them as his sheikh.⁸¹

In *Nafahat*, his attachment to his sheikh is related as follows, “In tariqa, his [Khwafi’s] attachment is to Sheikh ‘Abd al-Rahman Misri. Sheikh Nur al-Din ‘Abd al-Rahman gives him a perfect discipline and transmits him to the level of perfection and sheikdom.”⁸²

When Khwafi was in Egypt, he firstly served under Kamal Khujandi (d.1401). But, in time, he decided to find another sheikh, because Khujandi’s intimacy with young men displeased him.⁸³ So, he became the disciple of Sheikh Isma’il Sisi. After mentoring Khwafi for a while, Sheikh Isma’il Sisi convinces him to become the disciple of Sheikh Nur al-Din ‘Abd al-Rahman Misri.⁸⁴

Khwafi is a prominent figure in both the Islamic sciences and Sufism. In *Nafahat*, Jami describes him as one who comprehended both Islamic sciences and Sufism. Jami also quotes from Naqshibandi sheikh Muhammad Parsa. In this quotation, Parsa says, “...he [Khwafi] raises the flags of Sunna and effaces heresy and innovation. He follows the true path and he is passenger of the road of sharia and tariqa...”⁸⁵ This character of Khwafi reflects on the *Zayniyya* order as well. Khwafi is a scholar who gives great importance to Islamic sciences. Accordingly, he sets up the rule of finishing the study

⁸¹ Ibid., 28-30.

⁸² Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 547.

⁸³ H. T. Norris, “The *Mir’āt al-Ṭālibīn*, by Zayn al-Dīn al-Khawāfī of Khurāsān and Herat,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 53 (1990): 58.

⁸⁴ Köle, *Zeynüddîn*, 30.

⁸⁵ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 547.

on Islamic sciences before being a *Zayni* disciple. The *Zayniyya* order was formed in the hands of Khwafi, based on two of his prominent traits, the unity of sharia and Sufism and caution against heretic innovation.

Khwafi was an important figure in Herat for a long time. His opinions were esteemed and accepted by common people and the ruling class. For example, during the reign of Timur, it is said that a letter written by Khwafi influenced Timur greatly and led him to enact new laws regarding the affairs of state⁸⁶, and in 1419 the rulers of Sistan requested his mediation when they were surrendering to Shahrukh. Khwafi was a strict follower of sharia and sunna and also was a reliable figure in dream interpretation.⁸⁷ Furthermore, he established a balanced relation between himself and the ruling power. He was aware that Shahrukh, the ruling class, and the people did not approve of scholars who tried to become close to the ruling class in pursuit of worldly affairs. He never took an official post in Herat. However, he regularly used to preach in the main mosque in Herat.⁸⁸ Khwafi was also aware that he would face the danger of loosing his ability to function as an educator of the population if he cut his ties with the ruling class entirely. For example, he issued a fatwa saying that there was no problem with staying in the dervish lodges (*tekke*) and madrasas patronized by the rulers.⁸⁹ He used to maintain a balanced relation between him and the ruler, as Manz described.

A prominent scholar of the age, Jalal al-Din Qayini, was the link in the not intimate but functional and balanced relation between Shahrukh and Khwafi. As mentioned, Qayini was *muhtasib* and a scholar, trusted by Shahrukh. He also took other important official duties like going to non-Sunni lands under the rule of Shahrukh. Qayini was also a disciple of Khwafi and their children were married.⁹⁰ Moreover, Köle counts his name among the caliphs of Khwafi.⁹¹

⁸⁶ Köle, *Zeynüddin*, 19.

⁸⁷ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 229-30.

⁸⁸ Ibid, 229.

⁸⁹ Köle, *Zeynüddîn*, 20.

⁹⁰ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 211.

⁹¹ Köle, *Zeynüddîn*, 103.

Khwafi seems to have played a similar role to that of the deceased scholar and sufi ‘Abdullah Ansari. Khwafi helped Shahrukh legitimize in his reaction against *Hurufis*. He had been a famous scholar and Sufi since the reign of Timur. He was respected by people and religious class of Herat. And he had a strict attitude in following the path of sharia and sunna. Binbaş suggests that punishments and restrictions after the regicide attempt were not peculiar to only *Hurufis*. Shahrukh used the regicide attempt as a means to control the intellectual class that had been gaining increasing autonomy.⁹² In this control, Khwafi provides the legitimate basis.

The regicide attempt took place on 22 January 1427. Khwafi wrote his *Manhaj al-Rashad ra Wasita-i Salah-i I’tiqad-i ‘Ibad* in April 1428.⁹³ Khwafi suggests that he wrote the book so that Muslims could straighten their faith.⁹⁴ His purpose in the book is to define heresy and heretics (*ilhad* and *mulhid*) and to warn Muslims against the danger of heresy. In that sense, he praises Timur and Shahrukh for their loyalty to sharia and sunna. Khwafi praises them when he is mentioning the perversity of heretics. Just before the names of Timur and Shahrukh, he cites a verse from the chapter of “al-Hajj/40” from Qur’an that says, “Did not Allah check one set of people by means of another...”⁹⁵

The choice of the verse is significant if we consider its context. According to Ibn ‘Abbas,⁹⁶ Muslims first receive permission to carry out jihad with “al-Hajj/39,” which just preceded the verse Khwafi cited. And “al-Hajj/41” says, “(They are) those who, if We establish them in the land, establish regular prayer and give regular charity, enjoin the right and forbid wrong: with Allah rests the end (and decision) of (all) affairs.”⁹⁷ In this sense, Khwafi, indirectly but inarguably, legitimates and praises the

⁹² Binbaş, “Regicide Attempt,” 35.

⁹³ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 241.

⁹⁴ Zayn al-Din Khwafi, *Manhaj al-Rashad ra Wasita-i Salah-i I’tiqad-i ‘Ibad*, (SK, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, no. 2829), 7b.

⁹⁵ Qur’an 22:40.

⁹⁶ Ibn Abbas is one of companions and cousins of Prophet Muhammad and one of the earliest and the most respected scholars in the science of exegesis of Qur’an.

⁹⁷ Qur’an 22:41.

actions that would be carried out against those who are considered to be threatening the public order. Here, it would be wrong to suggest that Khwafi's sole intention was to pursue a political agenda. It would be more accurate to suggest that Khwafi sincerely believed that heretics were the reason for the dissension in the society. They vitiated the right path of Islam and in this way they harmed the unity of society. According to Khwafi, it was the duty of Shahrukh, as "Padishah-i Islam"⁹⁸ to exterminate the threat of heretics. In this sense, Shahrukh seems to have been a means of fulfilling this extermination for Khwafi. Likewise, for Shahrukh, it was not an easy task to suppress a religious group like the *Hurufis*, or, according to Binbaş, the whole realm of intellectuals. The support of Khwafi, as a respected scholar and Sufi, was important. The legitimating role played by Khwafi was used by Shahrukh as a means to avert possible reactions from the intellectual realm.

It is possible to describe the first fourteen folios of *Manhaj* as the introduction. In these folios, Khwafi gives short definitions of the terms he will use throughout the book and explains his intention for writing it. The rest of the book can be divided into two major chapters. In the first chapter, he counts the names of the prominent Sufis and quotes their definitions of Sufism. In the second chapter, he defines heresy. He divides heretics into two subcategories, the old heretics and the new-heretics,⁹⁹ and says which groups in the society are included in each category of heretics. By building the book in this format, Khwafi, in the first chapter, shows the right path of Sufism. He defines the true Sufism by adducing the words of the most respected Sufis. These definitions are almost always similar explanations to Khwafi's own approach. The common aspect for all the Sufis in the right path is "the loyalty to the Book, i.e. Qur'an, and the sunna."¹⁰⁰ When he gives the definition as such, the definition of the heresy becomes, naturally, not being loyal to the Qur'an and the sunna. In the second chapter, he explains the reasons for the disloyalty of the heretics. Khwafi uses very aggressive rhetoric in his explanations. Binbaş says, on the surface, the *Manhaj al-*

⁹⁸ Subtelny and Khalidov, "Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh," 211-12; Subtelny, *Timurids in Transition*, 110. Qayini, the disciple of Khwafi and *muhtasib* of Shahrukh, also described Shahrukh as *Padishah-i Islam*, in his book including advices for Shahrukh.

⁹⁹ Khwafi, *Manhaj*, 34b.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 28b.

Rashad is a polemic against Ibn 'Arabi and his views on the doctrine of oneness of being.¹⁰¹ Khwafi explicitly criticizes Ibn 'Arabi in some of his ideas; however, he does not use the aggressive tone in this criticism and definitely does not include Ibn 'Arabi in the category of heretics. Instead, he targets his followers and the doctrine of oneness of being.

2. 3. Khwafi and Ibn 'Arabi

In the passage where Khwafi discusses the Sufis on the right path, he classifies them into two categories: the early sheikhs and the later sheikhs. He says he will also mention the books that explain the regulations of Sufism. According to him, these books are four in number and they are respectable and reliable for Muslims. The first of these books is the *Ta'arruf dar Mazhab-i Tasawwuf* of Kalabadhi (d.990). The second book is *Risala* of Qushayri (d.1072). The third book is *'Awarif al-Ma'arif* of Shihab al-Din Suhrawardi (d.1234). The fourth book Khwafi mentioned is *Manazil al-Sa'irin* of Harawi (d.1089).¹⁰² These four books are the canonic texts of Sufism. There is nothing strange about the reference to these texts, and they say nothing to us about the issue of Khwafi's animosity toward Ibn 'Arabi. However, the reference to these books shows something else. *Manhaj* describes two ways of Sufism, the right one and the wrong one. By counting these books, Khwafi first describes the right path as loyalty to the Qur'an and the sunna since this approach is adopted by these books. The phrase of "loyalty to Qur'an and the sunna" maybe the most frequent phrase in *Manhaj*. Secondly, Khwafi marginalizes Sufi groups who do not accept these books as canonical and accordingly who do not accept the definition of "loyalty to Qur'an and the sunna."

After the description of these books and quotations from them, Khwafi starts to list the names of Sufis of the right path. He lists forty names of early sheikhs.¹⁰³ Again, these names are highly regarded by almost all Sufis. Many names in this list are included in the chains of initiation of various Sufi orders. For the category of later

¹⁰¹ Binbaş, "Regicide Attempt," 31.

¹⁰² Khwafi, *Manhaj*, 8a-8b.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 9a-27b.

sheikhs, Khwafi counts seventeen names and some of their books. What is remarkable about this list is that the last name is Sheikh Ibn 'Arabi. And right after his name Khwafi says, "All texts written by these sheikhs and other Arabian, Persian, and Turkish sheikhs are loyal to the Book and sunna." By asserting this phrase, Khwafi includes Ibn 'Arabi in the group of sheikhs of the right path. Khwafi extends his statement on Ibn 'Arabi by saying, "There are some controversial parts in the books of *Fusus* and *Futuhāt*." But according to Khwafi, Ibn 'Arabi, never denied the principals of Islam, such as prayer or fasting. That is why Ibn 'Arabi is not a heretic. Heretics are those who deny these principals.¹⁰⁴

After this part, the chapter on heresy starts. Khwafi says that he will explain the meaning and basis of heresy.¹⁰⁵ He classifies heretics into two groups: the old heretics and the new heretics.

According to Khwafi, the old heretics are simply the successors of Zorastrians and fire-worshippers (*majusiyan wa atash-parastan*). When they faced the powerful and mighty armies of Islam, they changed superficially but stayed same internally and became heretics. Prominent figures of these old heretics are Hamdan Qarmati (d.906) and Hassan Sabbah (d.1124).¹⁰⁶

According to Khwafi, the purpose of the new heretics was the same as that of the old heretics, and that is to abolish the regulations of Islam and sharia. These people yielded to their own bad desires and fell into heresy and subversion. Khwafi says that this sect, the new heretics, was a sect of chameleons. They changed their color but stayed the same internally. They always resorted to the lies and deception. They were a composite of four wrong sects: the sophists (*sufistayiyān*), materialists (*dahriyan*), philosophers (*falsafiyan-i ghayr-i tawabi'-i anbiya*), and the *wujudiyan*.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 29a.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 29b.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 31b-32a.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 35a.

According to Khwafi, the sophists believe that things have no existence and immutability (*wujud* and *thubut*) and what we see in this world is only illusion and fantasy. Their purpose is to depose sharia and sunna. They have to be beaten and burnt to understand that the whip and the fire have existence and to confess that things have existence. The sect of the materialists believe in the eternity of life and being. They reject the Day of Judgment and the Day of Resurrection. However they do not deny the existence of God. Philosophers do not believe in the afterlife, do not see politics and law as important things, and do not respect political authority. Here, Khwafi speaks with a furious rhetoric about scholars who respect and follow Greek philosophers. The sect of *wujudiyan* believes that existence is unique (*wahid*) and existence is truly and exclusively (*rast* and *bast*) the property of God. According to Khwafi, *wujudiyan* suggests that nothing has existence other than God. The existence of God does not have any external entification (*ta'ayyun*) and the existence of the visible things is actually the existence of God. The attributes of these visible things are the attributes of the divine knowledge (*'ilm-i ilahi*). It is not the attributes of their entified entity (*ta'ayyunat-ı 'ayni*). The existence of God (*wujud-i Haqq*) and the existence of created things (*wujud-i khalq*) are one and the same.¹⁰⁸

Just before the explanations of these heretic sects, Khwafi indicates a difference between the sect of the *wujudiyan* and the sect of the real monotheists (*muwahhidan-ı haqiqi*). He says that these two sects resemble each other in some aspects. However, according to Khwafi, if we examine some phrases of the latter sect, we see that they are not the same as those of the former. The latter sect is comprised of people of unveiling and verification (*ahl-i kashf ve tahqiq*). In spite of that, people of the sect of *wujudiyan* are not verifiers (*muhaqqiq*) but imitators (*muqallid*). Also, the sect of *wujudiyan* does not believe in the existence of heaven and hell. For them, nothing in the visible world has an existence of its own. They also see the commands and the prohibitions of sharia as changeable according to conditions.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁸ Khwafi, *Manhaj*, 35b-36a; Binbaş, "Regicide Attempt," 32-33.

¹⁰⁹ Khwafi, *Manhaj*, 35a.

According to Khwafi, people of the sect of *wujudiyan* are heretics but people of the sect of the real monotheists are not. The main difference between them is the difference between being a verifier and an imitator. According to this distinction, people of the real monotheists proceed on the true path with a true intuition and they gain a close level to God. They really experience the mystical states they mention. On the other hand, people of the *wujudiyan*, do not experience those states, however, they speak and act as if they do. That is why they are imitators. They do not have a close level to God, but they speak as if they do. And their suggestions about existence are contrary to the Qur'an and Sunna. That is why they are among the new heretics.

On the basis of these explanations, it seems as if Khwafi separates Ibn 'Arabi and his true followers, from the sect of the *wujudiyan*. But Khwafi does not articulate the content of these groups as he did for the old heretics. The question of "who the sect of the *wujudiyan* and the sect of the real monotheists are" is cloudy. The last pages of the book are more confusing, because, Khwafi clearly criticizes the doctrine of oneness of being, as articulated by Ibn 'Arabi.

In the last pages of *Manhaj*, Khwafi opens the subjects of the sect of the *wujudiyan* and Ibn 'Arabi again. This time, he suggests that the main problem of the sect of the *wujudiyan* is the absence of reason. This is because, according to Khwafi, everyone who has reason knows that the existence of God is distinct from the existence of anything other than God. Visible space and its content, i.e. created things, are nothing in reality. By asserting the lack of distinction between God and created things, the sect of the *wujudiyan* makes the same mistake as the sophists, and by doing so they commit blasphemy. Created things have accidents, such as illness and health, life and death, etc. If someone says God and created things are the same, then he attributes accidents like death and illness to God, and that is blasphemy. God is excluded from these accidents. Khwafi declares that, because of the enumerated reasons, the doctrine of oneness of being is wrong. According to Khwafi, the phrase of oneness of

being (*wahda al-wujud*) is asserted by the imitator *wujudiyan* and they are the new heretics. It is permissible with respect to the sharia to beat and kill them.¹¹⁰

The lines above contain the clearest of Khwafi's critiques of the followers of Ibn 'Arabi. Ibn 'Arabi never used the term of oneness of being in his texts.¹¹¹ However, this does not mean that the ascription of oneness of being to Ibn 'Arabi is wrong. The term was firstly and most frequently used by Farghani (d.1300), the student of Sadr al-Din Qunawi (d.1274).¹¹² First scholar who gives an extensive explanation of the term of oneness of being is 'Abd al-Razzaq Kashani (d.1335).¹¹³ And after him, term was accepted and used by prominent followers of the Akbari School and opponents of Ibn 'Arabi. The term of oneness of being became inseparable from Ibn 'Arabi. Accordingly, Khwafi's usage of the term of oneness of being allows us to think that Khwafi criticized the followers of Ibn 'Arabi in Herat. The question of who the people of the sect of the real monotheists and the sect of *wujudiyan* were would be more clear if we examine the sheikhs of the age of Shahrukh in the context of advocacy of the Akbari School.

During the age of Shahrukh, the issue of Ibn 'Arabi was a controversial subject. The ulema's complaint about Sheikh Khwarazmi's loyalty to the Akbari School and, again, the complaint of hadith scholars from Buhara about Sheikh Muhammad Parsa's loyalty to the Akbari School¹¹⁴ both show that the issue of Ibn 'Arabi was one of the main controversial subjects of the age. Similarly, Jami, in *Nafahat*, says that most of the jurists and the scholars of the exoteric sciences condemned Ibn 'Arabi, and only a small portion of the jurists and the Sufis considered him great. According to Jami, the debates were about some problematic phrases in the books of *Fusus* and *Futuhat*.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 44b.

¹¹¹ Mahmut Erol Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi* (İstanbul: İSAM, 2015), 117; Ibn 'Arabi, *The Meccan Revelations*, vol. 1, ed. Michel Chodkiewicz, trans. William C. Chittick, and James W. Morris (New York: Pir Press, 2005), 128.

¹¹² Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 153.

¹¹³ For this, see Ekrem Demirli, "Vahdet-i Vücûd," DİA.

¹¹⁴ Hamid Algar, "Reflections of Ibn 'Arabi in Early Naqshbandî Tradition," *Journal of Islamic Research* Vol:5 No:1 (1991 January): 5.

Jurists and scholars who condemned Ibn 'Arabi for blasphemy were not qualified enough to understand these phrases.¹¹⁵

Shahrukh's approach to the issue is unclear. The approach of Husayn Bayqara, the Timurid ruler of Herat from 1469 until 1506, is more clear. The jurists of Herat and Husayn Bayqara gathered in the mosque of Herat and they started to talk about the issue of Ibn 'Arabi. The jurists condemned Ibn 'Arabi as an infidel. At this point, Bayqara intervened and defended Ibn 'Arabi by making a legal interpretation (*ijtihad*).¹¹⁶

When we examine the sheikhs of the age of Shahrukh, we see some of them are in favor of the Akbari School. The case of Sheikh Khwarazmi was mentioned above. Beside him, first representatives of the order of *Naqshbandiyya* of Shahrukh's age are close to the Akbari School. For example, Sheikh Muhammad Parsa says that *Fusus* is the soul and *Futuhāt* is the heart and according to Parsa, the result of studying *Fusus* deeply is adhering to sunna completely.¹¹⁷ Also, Sheikh 'Ubayd Allah Ahrar (d.1490) gives importance to the books of Ibn 'Arabi and he benefits from Ibn 'Arabi's explanations greatly.¹¹⁸

The most prominent follower of Ibn 'Arabi, and also the most problematic sheikh of Herat is Qasim al-Anwar.¹¹⁹ He is known for the extreme interpretations of the doctrine of oneness of being in his poems. Also, some of his followers' ideas about young men and their close intimacy with each other gave rise to doubts about him. As we mentioned above, during the reign of Shahrukh, the capital city Herat was a center of attraction for people who were in the search of a sheikh. Among the sheikhs of Herat, Khwafi and Qasim al-Anwar had an international reputation and rivalry between them was stiff. As common features, both of these sheikhs had spent some time near sheikh Isma'il Sisi, and as Tosun asserts, both of them were affiliated with

¹¹⁵ Ökten, "Jāmī," 305.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 314-15.

¹¹⁷ Algar, "Reflections of Ibn 'Arabi," 2-3.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 9.

¹¹⁹ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 217.

the *Suhrawardiyya* order. The most apparent difference between them was loyalty to sunna and the doctrine of oneness of being. Qasim al-Anwar did not adhere to sunna as strictly as Khwafi and Khwafi was not as much in favor of the doctrine of oneness of being as was Qasim al-Anwar. Another difference between them was the position they held in Herat. Khwafi was a respected scholar and sheikh in Herat. In contrast, Qasim al-Anwar was a suspicious figure. One of Qasim's followers supposedly indulged in licentious behavior openly. Among the followers of Qasim al-Anwar, there was a group who believed that they would find divine unity by looking at the faces of young boys.¹²⁰ Many young men from the sons of amirs in Herat followed Qasim and the unmanageable character of Qasim's followers was a factor of concern. Here, we should remember that Khwafi had left the service of Kamal Khujandi because of his intimate relation with young men. Moreover, Qasim al-Anwar often used to move around the city in the company of a large retinue, and they did not show Timurid dynasty the respect it considered its due.¹²¹ Two biographical books also indicate that there was a conflict between Khwafi and Qasim al-Anwar. According to *Rashahat*, Khwaja Ahrar told Baha' al-Din 'Umar that in his dream, firstly Khwafi led him, but then he saw Qasim al-Anwar on a white horse and started to go in the direction Qasim pointed. The other source is Shah Ni'mat Allah's biographer Kirmani. He says that there was a group of members of the religious establishment who were in collusion against Qasim al-Anwar. According to Kirmani, one of these men was called Zayn al-Din.¹²²

After the regicide attempt on Shahrukh, Qasim al-Anwar was banished from Herat to Samarqand. This exile was made without direct evidence. The existence of Qasim's poetry book in the room of the assassin was the pretext of this exile. This exile was probably the result of Shahrukh's intention to oppress the learned class, as Binbaş suggests. And, as Manz suggests, "Khwafi's disapproval probably made it possible for the dynasty to exile Qasim."¹²³ Because of the stiff contention between Qasim and Khwafi and Qasim's apparent inclination for the doctrine of oneness of being, Khwafi

¹²⁰ In *Rashahat*, it is stated that Qasim distanced himself from them. See Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 232.

¹²¹ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 230-32.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 237.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 241-42.

probably thought that Qasim was among the sect of the *wujudiyan*, and therefore that he was a heretic.

Another problematic group of Shahrukh's age that can be associated with Ibn 'Arabi is the *Hurufis*. The part related to science of letters is the second chapter of *Futuhāt* and plays a key role for comprehension of the book.¹²⁴ Ibn 'Arabi, also wrote separate books about the subject, such as *Kitab Asrar al-Huruf*, *Kitab al-Alif*, *Kitab al-Ba*, and *Kitab al-Mim wa-l-Waw wa-l-Nun*. Also, he mentions the subject in chapters of five, twenty, and twenty-six of the *Futuhāt*.¹²⁵ According to Grill, "The science of letters can thus not be looked at independently of the science of the heavenly bodies or the cosmic cycles."¹²⁶ The twenty-eight letters in the alphabet refer to the twenty-eight levels of existence.¹²⁷ However, it would be wrong to suggest that *Hurufis* were Akbari because of their use of science of letters since it is a science widely accepted and used by many Sufis. It is known as the science of saints and accepted as a legacy from the forth caliphate 'Ali b. Abi Talib.¹²⁸ Yet, the usage of science of letters was enough for punishment in Herat after the regicide attempt on Shahrukh. Among the users of science of letters, the nuance between the followers of Fadl Allah Astrabadi (d.1394), who is the founder of the sect of *Hurufis*, and followers of Ibn 'Arabi was shaded. In this context, the connection between the *Hurufis* and Akbari School was probably established by Khwafi in his *Manhaj*.

According to Binbaş, in *Manhaj*, Khwafi's main concern is the unity of the community that is established and secured by Qur'an and sunna. Khwafi, in this respect, points his finger at new heretics (i.e. the sect of the *wujudiyan*) and blames them for destroying the unity of the community.¹²⁹ Chronologically, the closest case of disturbance in the community to the writing of *Manhaj* was the regicide attempt made by *Hurufis*. The common use of science of letters by *Hurufis* and Ibn 'Arabi,

¹²⁴ Ibn 'Arabi, *The Meccan Revelations*, vol. 2, ed. Michel Chodkiewicz, trans. Cyrille Chodkiewicz, and Denis Grill (New York: Pir Press, 2004), 107.

¹²⁵ Ibn 'Arabi, *Harflerin İlmî*, trans. Mahmut Kanık (Bursa: ASA Kitapevi, 2000), 13.

¹²⁶ Ibn al 'Arabi, *The Meccan Revelations*, vol. 2, 108.

¹²⁷ Ibn 'Arabi, *Harflerin İlmî*, 15.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 13-14.

¹²⁹ Binbaş, "Regicide Attempt," 33.

together with the regicide attempt, probably caused Khwafi to qualify *Hurufis* as the sect of the *wujudiyan*.

The third group that probably is in the category of the new heretics is the sheikhs of the order of *Nurbakhshiya*. According to Ökten, Muhammad Nurbakhsh supported his messianic claim by referring to the philosophers. He claimed that, were he still alive, Plato himself would have studied the philosophical sciences and mathematics under him. Also, his son Qasim Nurbakhsh claimed mastery over the works of Plato and Ibn Sina.¹³⁰ Muhammad Nurbakhsh was probably among the new heretics, according to Khwafi, because he used to respect Greek philosophers and legitimize his claim through them. Also, issuing coins and delivering khutba in his name was meant as a political threat for Shahrukh. Here, we should remember how Khwafi highlighted the feature of not respecting the political authority of philosophers. *Nurbakhshis* have both characteristics of Khwafi counted as belonging to philosophers: respecting Greek philosophers and threatening the political authority. As mentioned, Khwafi counts philosophers as a sect among the new heretics.

The best guess about the people of the sect of the real monotheists would be Sheikh Muhammad Parsa and his followers. Muhammad Parsa and Khwafi showed great respect to each other. Parsa, as mentioned above, describes Khwafi as "...he [Khwafi] raises the flags of Sunna and effaces heresy in innovation. He follows the true path and he is passenger of the road of sharia and Sufi order..."¹³¹ In return, in *Manhaj*, Khwafi praises Parsa as a "Guide of common and elite people, sheikh of Islam, leader of 'ulama and the best of the saints."¹³² After this qualification, Khwafi mentions the allegiance of Parsa to the Qur'an and sunna. Another indicator of Khwafi's respect for Parsa is that, after the death of Parsa, Khwafi sent a cenotaph to Medina for his grave.¹³³ In his book, Khwafi's discussion of Parsa is placed after the discussion about the sects of real monotheists and *wujudiyan*, as if Khwafi was trying to indicate that the place of Parsa was outside the sect of the *wujudiyan*.

¹³⁰ Ökten, "Jāmī," 285-86.

¹³¹ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 547.

¹³² Khwafi, *Manhaj*, 37b.

¹³³ Manz, *Timurid Iran*, 229; Köle, *Zeynüddîn*, 120.

In Khwafi's mind, the distinction between the sect of real monotheists and the sect of *wujudiyan* is not primarily a matter of creed. It is rather a distinction based upon personal and political concerns. Accordingly, the definition of heresy was a political definition and it had a religious connotation as well. We should think of this definition as a cluster that includes both religious and political concerns. As Khwafi put it frequently, heresy is to damage the unity of the community by not following the path of Qur'an and sunna. The appropriate figures this definition indicates are, not all, but certain followers of Ibn 'Arabi, i.e., *Hurufis* and Qasim al-Anwar. This means that following Ibn 'Arabi is not sufficient to become a heretic, but new heretics mainly stem from the followers of Ibn 'Arabi. Another requirement of being a heretic is to damage the unity of the community.

Khwafi clearly indicates that he does not include Ibn 'Arabi in the category of heretics. However, to follow his doctrine is a suspicious act. In the last two pages of *Manhaj*, he repeats his criticism against Ibn 'Arabi and this time he clarifies the parts that conflict with the Qur'an and sunna.

According to Khwafi, the main problem of the followers of the doctrine of oneness of being is their reduction of the essence of God to the essence of a human being. This is blasphemy and heresy. The main problem of the books of *Fusus* and *Futuhāt* is the parts related with the Pharaoh's belief. Ibn 'Arabi suggests that Pharaoh died as a believer in these chapters. According to Khwafi, this is wrong, because Pharaoh's faith was a faith of despair and it is not accepted according to unambiguous verses of the Qur'an. Khwafi indicates that Ibn 'Arabi suggests the validity of Pharaoh's faith because of the great compassion of Islam. However, it is wrong to offer esoteric interpretations for unambiguous verses of Qur'an. After these sentences, Khwafi says that the heart is ill. It does not express the truth.

It may have some gnostic knowledge (*ma'rifa*) but it does not see the truth.¹³⁴ Here, we should remember that Khwafi said that the main problem of the sect of *wujudiyan* was the absence of reason. Khwafi repeats the same criticism in his *Muhimmat al-Wasilin*, but this time indirectly. He says, "The faithful person resigns himself to God, because, servitude to Allah is the debt of Muslims. If a Muslim ignores this debt, he becomes just like Pharaoh. He said, 'I am your God' and God wrote his punishment in this world and hereafter."¹³⁵ Khwafi criticizes Ibn 'Arabi's thoughts on the matter of the seal of sainthood (*Khatm al-Walaya*) in his *Wasaya al-Qudsiyya*. According to Khwafi, Ibn 'Arabi's depiction of himself as the seal of the sainthood is wrong because the seal of sainthood is Muhammad Mahdi who will come in the future.¹³⁶

Even though Khwafi never qualified Ibn 'Arabi as a heretic, the biographical books that speak of the age give us solid evidences on the opposition of Khwafi to the ideas of Ibn 'Arabi.

In the translation of *Rashahat*, an anecdote is narrated between Sheikh Baha al-Din 'Umar and Khwaja Ahrar. Ahrar says, "One day I went to visit Sheikh Baha al-Din 'Umar. He asked, 'What is the news from the city?' I said, 'The followers of Zayn al-Din say "everything is from Him (*heme ez ust*)."' And the followers of Sayyid Qasim say, "Everything is Him (*heme ust*)."'¹³⁷ This passage tells us two things: first, that Khwafi is against the doctrine of oneness of being; and second, that the conflict between Khwafi and Qasim is a known and important issue in Herat.

Khwafi also indicates the danger of the doctrine of oneness of being in his *Wasaya al-Qudsiyya*. He says that when the heart of the mystical seeker of the right way is brightened with the light of divine unity, during the remembrance of *La ilaha illa Allah*, and when the divine lights illuminate every edge of the universe, the passenger understands that creation is not essential but a metaphoric reality named *majaziyya-i mumkina*. He observes the existence of God in his essential, eternal, and perpetual

¹³⁴ Khwafi, *Manhaj*, 44b-45a.

¹³⁵ Köle, *Zeynüddîn*, 312.

¹³⁶ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 191.

¹³⁷ Gülşenî, *Reşehât*, 299.

form. After that point, he starts contemplating the meaning of the phrase “there is no existence but God (*la mawjud illa Allah*)” when he is repeating the remembrance of *La ilaha illa Allah*. By performing this contemplation, the disciple will find the divine light of unity. However, for Kwafi, this is a difficult step; many disciples fall astray on this step.¹³⁸ In this passage, Khwafi, indirectly but clearly, warns his followers against the dangers of the doctrine of oneness of being. The phrase of *la mawjud illa Allah* evokes the doctrine of oneness of being. That is why Khwafi warns his followers.

The conflict between Khwafi and his disciple Ahmad Samarqandi was very famous in Herat at the time. The story narrated in *Nafahat* gives us a good comprehension of Khwafi’s criticism of Ibn ‘Arabi.

In *Nafahat*, it is said about Samarqandi, “He was one of Khwafi’s experienced disciples.” Indeed, from the narrative, we understand that Khwafi gave great importance to him. He appointed Samarqandi to the main mosque of Herat as preacher and went to listen to him. Khwafi also invited people to listen to his sermons. People liked Samarqandi’s sermons and in time the mosque got really crowded. People who came to listen to Samarqandi could not go into the mosque because of the crowd. However, after a point, the close relation between Samarqandi and Khwafi changed. Khwafi began to warn people against the preaching of Samarqandi. After Khwafi’s warnings, the number of people who attended to sermons decreased drastically. The reason behind the change of the relationship between Khwafi and Samarqandi was that Samarqandi started doing lessons of *Fusus* and reciting poems of Qasim al-Anwar.

In *Nafahat*, ‘Abd al-Rah̄man Jāmī (d. 898/1492) recites a dream of Samarqandi. He says that he saw this dream recorded at the end of a copy of *Fusus* in the handwriting of Samarqandi. It is written that:

After Prophet Muhammad directed me to the study of *Fusus*, I was in seclusion in Darwishabad. I saw Prophet Muhammad in my dream and asked him, “Oh Prophet, what is your opinion about Pharaoh?” He said, “What Ibn ‘Arabi said is true. He died as pure and cleansed.” Then I asked, “Oh my prophet, what do

¹³⁸ Köle, *Zeynüddîn*, 187.

you say about existence?" He said, "Did not you see Ibn 'Arabi says existence is present in eternity and temporary in creation (*al-wujud fi al-taqdim qadim wa fi al-hadith hadith*)." Then Prophet Muhammad continued, "You are divine and a creature. You are divine because the quality of divinity manifests itself in you. You are a creature because of your finitude and you are created." God is witness for my words.¹³⁹

The two questions Samarqandi asked refer to two important issues Khwafi mentioned in his *Manhaj*. The first question is about the ontological aspects of the doctrine of oneness of being. Khwafi opposes this doctrine and claims that its followers are heretics. In Samarqandi's dream, Prophet Muhammad answers the related question by quoting from Ibn 'Arabi. The second question Samarqandi asks is about the faith of Pharaoh. Ibn 'Arabi suggests that Pharaoh died as a believer. This statement provoked heated debates among Muslim scholars throughout the history of Islam. In *Manhaj*, Khwafi discusses the subject. He does not speak harshly about Ibn 'Arabi, but remarks that the phrase does not suit the Qur'an and sunna.

2. 4. Concluding Remarks

During his reign, Shahrukh made important changes with respect to the bases of administration. This is generally described as a sunnification project in the literature. However, he also maintained and showed respect for some parts of the Chinggisid law as well. This dual policy Shahrukh pursued raises question marks and shows that a re-examination of the age is necessary. For example, Ökten suggests examining the age by dividing it into three periods, with the important cases of the age as the breaking points of Shahrukh's policies. Manz argues that it would have been impossible for Shahrukh to pursue a religious agenda because of the amorphous and diffuse character of religious authority. She interprets Shahrukh's actions mainly as a legitimization policy. Also, she argues, the influence of his religious personality influences his policies greatly.

Shahrukh acted boldly when he was confronted with a direct threat against himself or the public order. Two cases shine out in this context, the cases of the *Nurbakhshiyya* and *Hurufiyya*. These were religious groups with many supporters.

¹³⁹ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 549-50.

Shahrukh reacted with serious retributions against them, such as execution, torture, and exile. This was not easy, and he required the legitimation of the religious class to be able to do that.

Khwafi was an important figure in this legitimation role. He had been a respected figure in Herat since the time of Timur. There was no doubt about his loyalty to the sharia and sunna. He took no official post, but his disciple Qayini was *muhtasib* of Shahrukh.

Khwafi wrote his *Manhaj* sixteen months after the regicide attempt. In this period, Shahrukh was probably dealing with Iskandar Qaraqoyunlu's occupations of the lands under his rule, including Sultaniyya. The prosecution of the *Hurufis* was also probably resuming, since the threat had not vanished completely.¹⁴⁰

In *Manhaj*, Khwafi defines heresy and warns Muslims against dangers of the contemporary heretics. He counts four groups of new heretics. These are sophists, materialists, philosophers, and *wujudiyan*. In the chapter on the *wujudiyan*, Khwafi asserts that there is a similar group with *wujudiyan* and it is the sect of the real monotheists. Despite the similarity, the later group is not heretic.

Khwafi chooses not to give the names of the people who belong to subcategories of the new heretics. However, their features give a solid idea of who they are. By mentioning philosophers, Khwafi was probably referring to the heresy of Muhammad Nurbakhsh and his followers. Beside *Nurbakhshis*, as we will see in the Chapter 4 of this thesis, followers of Ibn 'Arabi were frequently accused with polluting authentic Sufism with philosophy. By mentioning the *wujudiyan*, he was probably referring to Qasim al-Anwar, Ahmad Samarqandi and *Hurufis*. And by mentioning the real monotheists, he was probably referring to Sheikh Muhammad Parsa and his followers.

¹⁴⁰ In 1431-32, *Hurufis* revolted again in Isfahan. Manz, *Timurid Iran*, xvi.

Along with this categorization, Khwafi notes his criticisms of Ibn 'Arabi, because, the main problem of the *wujudiyan* is that they follow the doctrine of oneness of being. Khwafi does not label Ibn 'Arabi a heretic, because Ibn 'Arabi, despite some mistakes in the books *Fusus* and *Futuhāt*, does not deny the principals of Islam such as prayer and fasting. His mistakes are about the faith of Pharaoh and the seal of the sainthood. According to Khwafi, phrases mentioning these ideas do not suit the Qur'an and sunna. The most apparent and harsh of Khwafi's criticisms is about the doctrine of oneness of being. He says the followers of this doctrine commit blasphemy. However, Khwafi does not indicate the link between the doctrine of oneness of being and Ibn 'Arabi. Ökten, in this manner, draws attention to doubts about the circulation of Qunawi's texts.¹⁴¹ However, texts of Kashani, the first user of the concept of oneness of being, were probably circulating in Herat, since Kashani was the scholar who introduces Ibn 'Arabi and his ideas to lands we call Iran today. Kashani's commentary on *Fusus* was famous in these lands.¹⁴²

Khwafi's criticisms on the sect of *wujudiyan* shows that he was aware of ideas of Ibn 'Arabi and his followers on the doctrine of oneness of being. Approach of Khwafi is an interesting one. He does not label Ibn 'Arabi a heretic but says that ideas of the sect of *wujudiyan* are heresy and these ideas are very similar with Ibn 'Arabi's explanations in *Fusus* and *Futuhāt*. Furthermore, the rhetoric Khwafi used resembles a lot the tone used by prominent scholars of the early periods, like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun. Evaluations of these scholars will be examined in detail in Chapter 4. Then it will be clear that for example the term of *wujudiyan* indicates Ibn 'Arabi and his followers and the real threat of *wujudiyan* is for the Islamic community. Additionally, for example, accusation of reduction of the essence of God to the essence of a human being, which Khwafi ascribed for the followers of the doctrine of oneness of being, resembles greatly the accusation of incarnation (*hulul*), which is a crime ascribed by mentioned prominent scholars to Ibn 'Arabi and his followers. The refutations of these prominent scholars built a traditional way in refuting Ibn 'Arabi and frequently used by detractors of Ibn 'Arabi. Furthermore, the

¹⁴¹ Ökten, "Jāmī," 304-305.

¹⁴² Ekrem Demirli, *Tasavvufun Altın Çağı Konevî ve Takipçileri*, (İstanbul: Sufi Kitap, 2015), 282.

issues of Pharaoh's faith and seal of sainthood were titles firstly introduced by these prominent scholars. In this sense, Khwafi seems to be talking within this tradition even if he does not blame Ibn 'Arabi with heresy directly.

Here we are confronted with a junction where the political concerns of Shahrukh and the religious concerns of Khwafi coincided. The groups who were labeled heretics by Khwafi were actually the groups who threatened the authority of Shahrukh. So, we can conclude that, heresy was not simply a religious term. Another equally important requirement of being a heretic was to become a political threat. In this context, according to Khwafi, heretics mainly stemmed from the followers of the doctrine of oneness of being but this does not mean that everyone who follows this doctrine is heretic.

CHAPTER 3

'ABD AL-LATIF QUDSI: THE TRANSITIONAL FIGURE

This chapter examines the thoughts of Khwafi's disciple 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi settled in Konya. Afterwards he moved to Bursa. Actually there are three disciples of Khwafi who came to Anatolia. Other two are Sheikh Muhammed (d. before 1455) and Abdürrahim Rumi (d. after 1461). In this chapter, I will only focus on 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi since there is no sufficient information about Sheikh Muhammed and Abdurrahim Rumi is out of the context of this thesis. Neither Sheikh Muhammed nor Abdurrahim Rumi spoke of Ibn 'Arabi or the issue of heresy as far as we know.

I will examine two books by Qudsi: *Tuhfa Wahib al-Mawahib fi Bayan al-Maqamat wa al-Maratib* and *Kashf al-I'tiqad fi al-Radd 'ala Madhab al-Ilhad*. In his first book, *Tuhfa Wahib*, Qudsi explains the path of the spiritual seeker. He mentions the four cosmological realms (*a'lam*) and spiritual stations and levels (*maqamat* and *maratib*). I included this book into my inquiry since Akbari sheikhs also used these realms. So, this book is important with respect to show that if Qudsi adopted a doctrine that belongs to Akbari sheikhs. I will briefly compare Qudsi's and Akbari Sufis' approach to clarify Qudsi's attitude toward the Akbari School. I suggest that the pattern used by Qudsi is not peculiar to only Akbari Sufis. Qudsi adopted a pattern used more widely by Sufis regardless of their affiliation with Akbari School. The reason of my suggestion will be clearer in the Chapter 4 where I examine the pattern and terminology peculiar to Akbari Sufis. Qudsi's other book, *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, will be the main book of our inquiry in this chapter. The subject of *Kashf al-I'tiqad* is heresy. It is an extended version of Khwafi's *Manhaj*, and Qudsi addresses the issue of Ibn 'Arabi and heresy in a similar way. While Qudsi condemn him as a heretic, he criticizes the same issues relating to the ideas of Ibn 'Arabi such as the doctrine of oneness of being and Pharaoh's faith. Furthermore, he uses the same argumentations of the prominent scholars of early period such as Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun. Qudsi, like his sheikh Khwafi, speaks within the same tradition of refuting Ibn 'Arabi. This tradition and arguments will be clearer in the Chapter 4. However, we confront

with a different picture when Qudsi's relations in Anatolia are examined. Qudsi gets closer to Akbari Sufis. For example, his relation with Molla Fenari and mystical experience in the tomb of Sadr al-Din Qunawi are outstanding.

Another interesting part of *Kashf al-I'tiqad* is Qudsi's evaluations on the sect of *Hurufis*. In the mind of Qudsi, *Hurufis* do not indicate only Sufis who use science of letters. The term has a wider content. Qudsi, on the margins of the pages he explained heresy of *Hurufis*, adds other heretic figures he met during his voyage to Anatolia. All these names are heretics and most of them do not have a relation with *Hurufis* or the science of letters.

3. 1. 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi (d. 1452)

Abd al-Latif Qudsi was the most important representative of Zayniyya order in Anatolia. He had a great influence on the expansion of Zayniyya order in Anatolia, the Balkans, and Istanbul. He trained important disciples during the period of establishment of Sufi culture in the Ottoman state.

He was born in Jerusalem in 1384. His real name is 'Abd al-Latif b. 'Abd al-Rahman b. Ahmad b. 'Ali b. Ghanim al-Maqdisi.¹⁴³ His bloodline went back to the tribe of Bani Khazraj¹⁴⁴ on the father's side, and to the Prophet Muhammad on his mother's.¹⁴⁵

Qudsi met with Zayn-al Din Khwafi, in 1422, when Khwafi was passing through Jerusalem on his way to hajj. Qudsi hosted Khwafi in his home and requested to accompany him on his way to hajj. Khwafi rejected this request because Qudsi's mother was ill but promised to take him to Khorasan upon his return. Khwafi was Qudsi's second sheikh and Qudsi restarted his progress on the spiritual path beside him. After a while, he went to city of Jam on the advice of his sheikh and went into a special forty-days seclusion near the shrine of famous sheikh Ahmad Jami-i Namaqi.

¹⁴³ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 550; Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 66.

¹⁴⁴ A famous family in Madina. See the article of "Hazrec (Benî Hazrec)" in DİA for further information.

¹⁴⁵ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 36.

During this period, he routinely informed Khwafi about his spiritual states. After a while, Khwafi gave him the authorization in tariqa.¹⁴⁶

Qudsi came back to his hometown, Jerusalem, in 1425. The sources usually state that Qudsi went to Anatolia twice. First is before 1431 and the second is in 1447. In the second trip, Qudsi arrived in Konya in 1448.¹⁴⁷

In Konya, Qudsi visited tombs of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi, Sadr al-Din Qunawi, and Shams al-Din Tabrizi respectively. He tells his mystical experiences in these tombs as follows; “I saw myself naked when I visited the tomb of Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi. Then, I visited the tomb of Sadr al-Din Qunawi. Top of his blessed grave was made of tree and in the shape of dome. A branch from this tree caught from my skirt and pulled me toward his grave. Then, I visited the tomb of Shams al-Din Tabrizi. He requested me to perform prayer on his grave.”¹⁴⁸ Qudsi settled in the lodge of Qunawi and carried out his activities there.¹⁴⁹

Qudsi left Konya for Bursa on 13 August 1451. He claims that a divine command ordered him to leave Konya and this command said; “Do not stay with them.”¹⁵⁰ In the first day of his journey, Qudsi heard a voice in his dream, which told him, “Hurry up! People of gnostic knowledge (*ahl-i ma'rifa*) are waiting for you!” He said, “I could not see who said these words. I arrived in Bursa in the beginning of the month of Shaban. I, together with a group of ulama, got into the seclusion (*khalwa*) starting from the last ten days of Shaban till the end of the month of Ramadan. In the first day of seclusion, I heard an absent voice telling me, ‘This is a community from the heaven¹⁵¹, and there is no one like them on earth.’” On 12 October 1451, his

¹⁴⁶ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 551; Taşköprizade, *Shaqa’iq*, 66-67; Vassaf, *Sefine-i Evliya*, 1:322-23; Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 36-37.

¹⁴⁷ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 79.

¹⁴⁸ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 550; Taşköprizade, *Shaqa’iq*, 67.

¹⁴⁹ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 41; Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 80.

¹⁵⁰ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 42.

¹⁵¹ This word has been written in two different ways in sources. In *Nafahat*, it is written as *jinni* which refers to a group of creatures created from the fire. (Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 550.) In the *Shaqa’iq*, it is written as *al-janna*, which means heaven. (Taşköprizade, *Shaqa’iq*, 68.) Tek also writes, in the appendix of book of Qudsi’s *Tuhfa*, it is written as *al-janna*. And according to Tek, most of the sources write the

important disciple Sheikh Vefa, other disciples Khayr al-Din Khalil and el-Hajj Muhammad el-Halabi arrived in Bursa together with Qudsi's family.¹⁵²

Qudsi fell ill in the beginning of the month of Dhu al-Hijjah in 856/1452 and passed away on 22 March 1452 in the castle of Bursa. He is buried to the terrain near his lodge. This district, later, called as Zeyniler, with respect to 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi and his order.¹⁵³

'Abd al-Latif Qudsi was a productive author and wrote most of his books in the field of Sufism. All of his books were in Arabic. However, he occasionally used Persian for the poems he included in these books. His high education in the Islamic sciences is clear from the frequent references in his books to such fields as kalam, fiqh, and logic.

Qudsi's stance toward Ibn 'Arabi and his intellectual inheritance is unique. On the one hand, he follows his sheikh Khwafi on the issue of heresy and advances Khwafi's approach by adding new groups of heresy to his book, *Kashf al-I'tiqad*. In this book, he also agrees with his sheikh's criticisms of the doctrine of oneness of being, which labels this doctrine as unificationism (*ittihad*) and incarnation (*hulul*). These terms are frequently used by prominent scholars for refuting Ibn 'Arabi and his disciples as I will show in the Chapter 4 of this thesis. On the other hand, his mystical experience at the tomb of Qunawi and his choice of Qunawi's lodge as his center of activities seem contrary to his ideas about the doctrine since Qunawi is the most prominent Akbari figure in Anatolia. Furthermore, Qudsi's friendship, and probable Sheikh-disciple relation, with another prominent figure of Akbari School in Anatolia, Molla Fenari is significant. Molla Fenari most probably became the disciple of Qudsi. Even if he did not, the poems they wrote for each other indicate that Qudsi did not show the same attitude against Molla Fenari as Khwafi had shown toward Samarqandi.

word as *al-janna*. (Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 43.) I chose to translate the word of *al-janna*, according to evidences.

¹⁵² Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 550; Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 67-68; Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 42-43.

¹⁵³ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 552; Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 69; Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 44.

3. 2. Qudsi's Loyalty to his Sheikh Zayn al-Din Khwafi

In this section, I will examine Qudsi's loyalty to his sheikh, Khwafi, in the light of Qudsi's *Tuhfa Wahib* and *Kashf al-I'tiqad*. In *Tuhfa Wahib*, Qudsi explains the cosmological realms and stations for the spiritual seeker. I will show that Qudsi's approach resembles his sheikh's ideas about the issue and is different from Akbari School's famous doctrine of the levels of existence (*maratib al-wujud*).¹⁵⁴ On this subject, Qudsi chooses to follow his sheikh. Secondly, I will examine Qudsi's loyalty to his sheikh on the issue of heresy and Ibn 'Arabi in his book *Kashf al-I'tiqad*. Qudsi wrote this, his largest book, as a refutation of erroneous and heretic sects. He counts twenty-one sects that are on the wrong path: The Mu'tazila, Malamatiyya, Jabriyya, Batiniyya, Qadariyya, Dahriyya, Hululiyya, Hurufiyya, Noktaiyya, Ibahiyya, Philosophers, Sophists, Tabi'iyya and 'Adatiyya, Najjariyya, the ones who say neither body nor soul will suffer in the afterlife, *Wujudiyya*, the ones who say they are not the agent of their deeds, Karramiyya, the ones who say atom is the substance, magicians, and lastly, the ones who say saints have the soul of God and they should be worshiped as well. This book is an extended version of Khwafi's *Manhaj*. I will not touch upon the issue of Ibn 'Arabi in this section since it will be done in the next section. In this part, I will only examine Qudsi's considerations of the sect of *Hurufis*. The section on *Hurufis* is important since it shows how Qudsi's ideas developed by being influenced by his sheikh's ideas about the issue and the regicide attempt occurred in Herat. In this sense, Qudsi carries a debate in Herat to another context, Anatolia. He writes, on the margins of the pages that he explained *Hurufis*, heretics he came across with during his voyage to Anatolia. Some of the names he mentioned do not have relation with *Hurufis* or the science of letters. Nevertheless they are labeled as *Hurufi*.

The sects related with Ibn 'Arabi's ideas will be examined in the subsequent section of *Hurufis*. The importance of this section is that Qudsi adopts the terminology and approach aforementioned tradition on refuting Ibn 'Arabi by following his sheikh Khwafi.

¹⁵⁴ The details of this doctrine are given in Chapter IV.

3. 2. 1. Spiritual Stations and Levels (*Maqamat wa Maratib*) and Cosmological Realms (*A'lam*) for Abd al-Latif Qudsi

In the terminology of Sufism, the term of realms (*a'lam*) are usually used to refer levels or spheres of cosmos. According to orientation of Sufi, these realms may indicate an external reality or a divine experience of spiritual seeker. Sufi theorists speak of a number of realms. Each of these realms has a significant aspect and shows the seeker another face of reality. Furthermore, each realm refers a specific station for spiritual seeker and in every station the duty of the seeker changes. Names and number of these realms vary according to orientation of a Sufi.¹⁵⁵ However, the general structure stays same. The main difference is in the perception of the structure. Akbari Sufis, usually perceive these realms as the process of creation of cosmos. They interpret and tell realms as the process of theophany and entification of the absolute entity and hence they explain these realms from top to down. Details of this approach will be given in the Chapter 4. Sufis who do not show their intimacy with Akbari School or even Sufis who lived before Ibn 'Arabi perceive these realms as an experience that spiritual seeker pass through. Hence, they explain these realms from the lowest to top.

Qudsi's *Tuhfa Wahib al-Mawahib fi Bayan al-Maqamat wa al-Maratib* is among the books that explain realms from down to top. In *Tuhfa*, Qudsi explains stations and levels (*maqamat wa maratib*) that will be experienced by the spiritual seeker. He counts four spiritual stations and six levels.

First station is the station of soul self (*nafs*¹⁵⁶). In this station, the divine lights, sovereignty, and humanity are expressed. This reference is to realm of humanity and

¹⁵⁵ Renard, Sufism, 197.

¹⁵⁶ The sum of natural human tendencies whose centrifugal effects continually threaten to distance the individual from the true center, God. One's "lower self" or "ego-soul" (*nafs*, also rendered as soul), often symbolized by the dog or the ass, is described in the Qur'an as functioning in various ways: inciting to evil (12:53); blaming or admonishing, serving as a kind of conscience (75:2); and bringing about a peaceful condition resulting from its purification (89:27). Sufi theorists incorporated this scriptural typology into their systems of spiritual formation in different ways, differing somewhat from one order to another. But underlying almost all Sufi thought on spiritual discipline is the fundamental notion that the "greater jihad" is the struggle with one's ego. Some theorists devised elaborate

sovereignty (*'alam al-mulk wa nasut*), which is the lowest station in the terminology of Sufism. According to Qudsi, this station is the beginning of unity of deeds (*tawhid al-af'al*¹⁵⁷). This realm is dominated by the sense perception. Second level is the level of spirit (*ruh*¹⁵⁸). In this station lordly dominion is expressed which is a clear reference to realm of the lordly dominion (*'alam al-malakut*). This realm is the second from down to top and end of unity of deeds and beginning of unity of attributes (*tawhid al-sifat*¹⁵⁹). Third level is the level of heart (*qalb*¹⁶⁰).

The realm of divine power (*'alam al-jabarrut*) manifests itself in this station. This station is the unity of attributes. The fourth and last level is the level of inmost consciousness (*sirr*¹⁶¹). In this level, the realm of pure divinity (*lahut*) is expressed. This realm is the top realm of cosmos. This level is the unity of essence (*tawhid al-*

typologies in which the various conditions of the ego represented up to seven stages in ethical rather than mystical development, moving from inciting to evil, to blameworthy (rather than admonishing), to inspired toward more positive inner deeds, to peaceful, to contented, to accepted (by God), and finally perfected or fully purified. Whatever the specific system or typology, the ego constitutes, along with Satan and the material world with all its blandishments, one of the critical sources of misguidance for seekers. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 79-80.

¹⁵⁷ This is the lowest level of unity. In this level, seeker starts seeing everything as a result of God's wish since He is the creator of universe. See Mevlüt Özler, "Tevhid," DİA for further information.

¹⁵⁸ A human faculty that typically represents positive inner impulses and drives. It engages in a tug-of-war with the soul self (*nafs*) to win over the ever-changeable heart. Some Sufi psychological theories add the element of "natural disposition" to the mix, interposing it between spirit and heart. In addition, many Sufi authors describe the spirit as highly mobile, able to depart from the body during sleep and returning during the waking state; though it leaves the body at death, it will be united with the body in resurrection. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 226.

¹⁵⁹ In this level, seeker ascribes attributes only peculiar to God no one but God. Some of these attributes are eternity and immortality. Furthermore, seeker does not resemble God with his creatures because of the attributes that are valid for both God and people. For example, the attribute of alive; being alive is valid for both God and people however, it does not mean that God is similar to people. See Mevlüt Özler, "Tevhid," DİA for further information.

¹⁶⁰ Both a physical organ essential to life and the human faculty at the center of all spiritual experience. It is therefore the focus of Sufi discernment and spiritual direction, known as the science of hearts, a term first used by Hasan al-Basri. A seeker's life long project is "polishing the mirror of the heart" through the various ascetical and contemplative disciplines, which burnish away the rust and corrosion of self-deceit and all the soul self's considerable powers of obfuscation. Sufis are fond of a Sacred Hadith in which God says that though the heavens and earth are too small for Him, in the human heart there is ample room. The Arabic term for heart is *qalb*, from a root that means to turn or rotate (i.e., fluctuate or vacillate), because the heart is susceptible to the attractions of the soul self as well as the spirit. (The most common Persian term is *dil*.) The "greater jihad" is therefore analogous to a kind of tug-of-war between soul self and spirit to win the heart's attentiveness. This is a tripartite model devised by Ja'far al-Sadiq and further developed by Kharraz, and it ranks among the earliest models of Sufi psychology. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 105.

¹⁶¹ Inmost consciousness (*sirr*) is explained by some Sufi theorists as a faculty that is placed at the center of heart. Term can also be translated as mystery. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 105.

*dhat*¹⁶²).¹⁶³ As we see, Qudsi counts realms from the lowest to top. By doing so, he actually intends to explain this cosmos as a spiritual experience. The seeker starts from the lowest realm, the realm of humanity and tries to reach to the top realm.

The taxonomy of cosmos with four levels is not peculiar to Akbari School. For example, famous Sufi ‘Abd al-Qadir Jilani (d.1165-66) speaks of this taxonomy with four levels in his *Risala al-Ghawthiyya*, also known as *Mi’rajiyya*. Jilani asserts that ia is between the levels of humanity and lordly dominion. Tariqa belongs to sphere between the levels of lordly dominion and divine power. And Truth is between the levels of divine power and pure divinity.¹⁶⁴ Jilani is a sufi who lived before Ibn ‘Arabi. In this sense, his usage of this framework shows that the usage of the taxonomy with four levels does not definitely mean that user is a member of the Akbari School if he did not use the terms peculiar to Akbari School like nonentification or immutable entities. Qudsi does not use the Akbari terminology and his stance resembles Jilani’s perspective.

After expressing organization of realms, Qudsi explains spiritual levels of Sufis in pursuit of reaching God (*wisal*), i.e., the realm of pure divinity. Qudsi counts six levels. In the first level, soul becomes liberated from the slavery of hearth. In the second, the seeker carries out a continuous journey toward God. In the third, contrasts appear in the existence. Fourth level is drowning in the sea of observation. In the fifth level the seeker realizes truths of the perfection, and the sixth level is to reach perfection of spiritual arrival (*wisal*).¹⁶⁵

As a general perspective, the book does not tell the creation of cosmos, or spheres of theophany of the absolute entity. It gives a route for the spiritual seeker. With other words, the narrative of the books is not built from top to down but from down

¹⁶² The unity of essence means to accept God as one and only in its true meaning. At this level, seeker understands that his essence is nothing else but God Himself. . See Mevlüt Özler, “Tevhid,” DİA for further information.

¹⁶³ ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi, *Tuhfa Wahib al-Mawahib fi Bayan al-Maqamat wa al-Maratib*, (SK, HALET Efendi, no. 246), 34a.

¹⁶⁴ Trimmingham, *The Sufi Orders*, 160.

¹⁶⁵ Qudsi, *Tuhfa Wahib*, 34a.

to top. It does not give the route of God, as in the entification and theophany processes or levels, but gives the true path for seeker. It explains the journey of the spiritual seeker and explains the states that will be experienced by him. In this explanation, we do not confront with an Akbarian terminology. For example, he does not speak of the level of nonentification or immutable entities. Even though the subject of the book is the realms of cosmos from one perspective, Qudsi mentions them with respect to spiritual stations and levels that a seeker will pass through. In this sense, it is hard to claim that this book shows an Akbarian tendency. It would be truer to claim that, the book shows a tendency that belongs to a more widely used method by Sufis like Jilani and many more.

One of users of this taxonomy is Qudsi's sheikh, Zayn al-Din Khwafi. Khwafi, in his *Wasaya al-Qudsiyya*, uses the terms of unity of deeds and unity of attributes. As the third level, he uses the term of true unity but he uses it in a sense that refers unity of essence.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore he also uses the terms of the stations of soul self and heart.¹⁶⁷ Khwafi's *Wasaya al-Qudsiyya* comprises of advice of Khwafi to those who starts the spiritual journey. Hence, he explains what to do and what to abstain from in these stations. In this sense, Qudsi's approach is quite similar to Khwafi's. Qudsi follows his sheikh in the issue of cosmological realms.

3. 2. 2. Hurufis in Qudsi's *Kashf al-I'tiqad*

Qudsi's loyalty to his sheikh saliently manifests itself in his *Kashf al-I'tiqad* in the issue of heretics and especially *Hurufis*. Its purpose of writing is the same as Khwafi's in the *Manhaj*. When Qudsi explains this purpose he says, "Some students from the field of fiqh asked me to write this book. This book reveals and refutes hidden doctrines of heretics. This refutation grounds on the sharia and reason."¹⁶⁸

It won't be wrong to identify Qudsi's *Kashf al-I'tiqad* as a commentary on Khwafi's *Manhaj*. Qudsi thinks same as Khwafi on the bases and damages of heresy and heretics. However, Qudsi develops further the groups categorized under the title of

¹⁶⁶ Bekir Köle, "Zeynüddin-i Hafi Hayatı, Eserleri, Tasavvuf Anlayışı ve el-Vasâya'l-Kudsiyye'nin Tahkiki" (master's thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2002), 135.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 178.

¹⁶⁸ Abd al-Latif Qudsi, *Kashf al-I'tiqad fi al-Radd 'ala Madhab al-Ilhad*, (BEEK, Genel, no. 1479/5), 250.

heretics. Khwafi, as mentioned in the related chapter, divides heretics into two subcategories as old heretics and new heretics. He counts two groups under the title of old heretics, Zoroastrians and fire-worshippers. And according to Khwafi there are four groups under the title of new heretics and they are sophists, materialists, philosophers and sect of *wujudiyan*¹⁶⁹. Qudsi counts twenty-one groups under the title of heretics. Among them are Zoroastrians, fire-worshippers, sects of sophists, materialists, philosophers, and sect of *wujudiyan*. Also, as I suggested, in Khwafi's *Manhaj*, *Hurufis* are also labeled as heretic indirectly. Qudsi directly mentions the name of *Hurufis* as heretic.¹⁷⁰ Actually, Qudsi does not use the term of *mulhid* (heretic) as frequently as Khwafi. In the beginning, he uses the term and labels each of groups he mentions as heretic. But, in the sections that he explains the aspects of these groups, he labels them as the lured sect (*maftunin*).

I will not mention all of lured sects Qudsi counted in his book since it exceeds the limits of this work. I will examine the sect of *Hurufis* since it is the sect that was criticized by Khwafi and also because this issue is important with respect to subject of Qudsi's disciple Sheikh Vefa. Furthermore, the part of *Hurufis* in *Kashf al-I'tiqad* seems to be the most interesting one. Qudsi finishes writing of the book in Damascus before his second journey to Anatolia.¹⁷¹ However, in Anatolia, he adds notes on the heretics that he met during his voyages in Anatolia. Hence, it gives a good perspective on the heretics in Anatolia from the eyes of Qudsi.

According to Qudsi *Hurufis* believe in the eternity of letters and letters are essence (*'ayn*) of things. From this point of view, *Hurufis* suggest the sameness of essence of God and the essence of letters. Qudsi rejects this suggestion. According to him, existence of letters is with the changeable and pronounced things. So, their essence cannot be same as God's.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁹ *Sufistayyan, Dahriyan, Falsafiyân-ı ghayr-i tavabî'-i anbiya*, and lastly *wujadiyan*. Khwafi, *Manhaj*, 35a.

¹⁷⁰ Qudsi, *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, 337.

¹⁷¹ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 49-50.

¹⁷² Qudsi, *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, 337-38.

Qudsi counts seven names for the heretics he saw in his journeys. First of these seven names is Husayn Akhlati. He claimed deity in Egypt. He used to know the science of letters and he was an expert in using it. It is also related that he used to know the sorcery of jinni. He used to rule them. He used to make gemstones like gold and silver because of his knowledge on the science of jinni. He had the Mamluk Sultan of the age, Malik al-Zahir Barquq (d.1399), under his spell. It is said that Sultan Barquq used to follow all of his orders. Akhlati was one of the most prominent heretics and infidels. He promulgated his sect in many lands like Iraq, Khorasan, Transoxiana, Sijistan, Damascus, and Egypt. Akhlati died in Egypt. According to Qudsi, reason of his death is the curse of great sheikh 'Abd al-'Aziz Ghaznawi Khorasani. Akhlati served Khorasani as his disciple when he was younger. Then he abandoned him. Khorasani fell ill but Akhlati did not visit him. Therefore, Khorasani cursed him. According to Qudsi, Akhlati is the last of infidels who claimed deity during his age.¹⁷³

Qudsi, after Akhlati, starts mentioning Akhlati's student Taj al-Thulami Jilani. According to Qudsi, he claimed prophecy. He promulgated his heresy in lands like al-Dara Marwazi, Khorasan, Iraq and others.¹⁷⁴

After Jilani, Qudsi mentions another student of Akhlati, one that has significance in our context. He is Simavna Kadısı Oğlu Şeyh Bedreddin Mahmud (d.1420). According to Qudsi, Sheikh Bedreddin, because of his heresy and hostility toward Muslims, went to infidels and asked them to occupy lands of Ottoman State. Mehmet I killed Sheikh Bedreddin, after he vitiated creed of Anatolian Muslims who believed in him. Mehmet I was right in the decision of sentence of death.¹⁷⁵

Fourth name Qudsi counts as heretic is the student of Sheikh Bedreddin, Muhammed Şirin. He is a Turkish man from Ardabil and also known with the name of Isfahani. According to Qudsi, he read books of sheikhs and mastered his knowledge on Sufism. He built his ideas on the basis of philosophy and exaggerated it such an extent that

¹⁷³ Ibid., 338-39.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 339.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

he asserted what has been asserted to him by the void sects. Then, he went to Sheikh ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Shibrisi, who is sheikh of Khwafi, to become his disciple. Sheikh ‘Abd al-Rahman asked him to throw away his books to the Nile River. He rejected and left him.¹⁷⁶

Qudsi also mentions the name of his important disciple Sheikh Vefa on the margins of these page. According to Qudsi, Muhammed Şirin, one day, mounted his horse as the leader of 200 men army. Some of his soldiers were cavalry and some of them were on foot. His soldiers were in separate parts, one part of them consisted of assassins, another part was heretic, and the rest was drunk. They went to Sheikh Vefa in order to kill him. When they arrived, Sheikh Vefa was performing daily prayer. Allah gave him such grandness that they could not dare to attack him. None of them could get near him. They returned empty-handed.¹⁷⁷

Fifth name Qudsi counted among the heretics is remarkable. Qudsi gives the name of Qasim al-Anwar. According to Qudsi, Sayyid Qasim claimed mahdi-hood. He stabbed Shahrukh from his abdomen in order to kill him and capture his lands. Shahrukh recovered from stabbing after the treatment. He killed many from the friends of Sayyid Qasim.¹⁷⁸

Sixth name Qudsi mentioned is Akbıyık. According to Qudsi, he is also from Anatolia. He used to sit and sleep on dirty places and mingle with women. He was one of the biggest *İbahis*¹⁷⁹. He deceived many from the ruling class, scholars, merchants, and women. He used to order spiritual contemplation (*muraqaba*¹⁸⁰) to his own image in every situation such as during daily prayer and even sexual intercourse.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 339-40.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 341-42.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 340

¹⁷⁹ In general, *ibahi* means, one who does not adopt the rules of religion and deems religious prohibitions permissible. See the article of “İbâhiyye” in DİA.

¹⁸⁰ Various referring to method and/or content of various forms of interior prayer. A Sufi might “contemplate” using the method of focusing on a particular mental image, a kind of visualization technique. The goal of the process is to achieve communion with the object of contemplation, whether that is an image of the mystical Beloved or one’s sheikh or the spirit of a deceased holy person, including the Prophet. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 65.

¹⁸¹ Qudsi, *Kashf al-I’tiqad*, 340.

Last and seventh name is Fakih Dede. Qudsi met him when he was in Konya. Hence, information on him is written on the margins of these pages. According to Qudsi, he used to deny life in grave, resurrection, and hereafter. When this person started to move away from world and look like a Sufi, sinners, heretics, and apostates gathered around him. Fakih Dede and his followers started to lock doors of mosques, treat people who come to mosque for prayer as enemies, and constrain Muslims from fasting, daily prayer, hajj, and zakat. This person says religious obligations are unnecessary. Qudsi says, "I don't know if he repented in his later life but Muslims became saved from his malice after his death."¹⁸² According to Qudsi, all of these names are belong to the group of lured sects (*maftunin*).¹⁸³

Two names stand out among heretics Qudsi counted, Sheikh Bedreddin and Qasim al-Anwar. For Qasim al-Anwar, the information Qudsi gave is apparently wrong. The one who attacked Shahrukh was not Qasim al-Anwar but Ahmad-i Lur, a member of the sect of *Hurufiyya*. As we mentioned, Qasim al-Anwar was not directly involve in the accident. However, he was exiled from Herat because of the suspicion of his involvement in the sect of *Hurufiyya*. The existence of Qasim's poetry book in the room of assassin was the pretext of this exile. Also, if we remember, members of a religious establishment in Herat were in collusion against Qasim al-Anwar. Zayn al-Din Khwafi was among them. Qudsi, just like Khwafi, accuses Qasim al-Anwar with the membership of the sect of *Hurufiyya*, even though he was not a member of them directly.

In the case of Sheikh Bedreddin, we see a similar pattern. Sheikh Bedreddin's only connection with *hurufis* is his sheikh Husayn Akhlati. Apart from that, it is hard to find a connection of Sheikh Bedreddin with *Hurufiyya*. He did not use science of letters as a method in his books. Yet this situation did not constrain Qudsi from labeling Sheikh Bedreddin as a *Hurufi*. Qudsi does for Sheikh Bedreddin what Khwafi did for Qasim

¹⁸² Ibid., 339-40.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 340.

al-Anwar. It seems, for these two Zayni sheikhs *Hurufiyya* acquired a meaning transcending the word's widely known terminological reference.

Ocak asserts, during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, divinity/deity and Mahdi-hood aspects of *Hurufiyya* effectuate the bases of heresy in Ottoman lands and this situation starts with Sheikh Bedreddin.¹⁸⁴ At least in the minds of Khwafi and Qudsi, probably this was not the context. Qudsi mentions heresy, deity, and Mahdi-hood in the pages mentioning *Hurufis* as if the framework verifies Ocak's claim. However, he also mentions claim of prophecy, sorcery, philosophy, and *Ibaha* on the same pages. It would be over interpretation to indicate *Hurufiyya* was the basis of claim of prophecy, sorcery, philosophy, and *Ibaha* beside divinity/deity and *Mahdi-hood* as Ocak did. It would be more accurate to determine place of the term of *Hurufiyya* in a higher level close to heresy. In the minds of these two Zayni sheikhs the term of *Hurufiyya* seems like a cluster, which contains religious exorbitances like claim of prophecy, sorcery, deity, Mahdi-hood etc. just like the terms of heresy and *maftunin*.

This perspective that make closer the cluster that is referred with the term of *Hurufi* to the cluster of heretic shows that Qudsi is influenced by the regicide attempt in Herat. Khwafi, criticized them harshly and Qudsi took another step and made the term of *Hurufi* equal to the term of heretic. Surely, usage of the science of letters was one of the aspects of *Hurufis* but also claiming deity or other heresies were included, too.

After this passage, Qudsi gives more details about the characteristics of *maftunin*. He says, "We ask from God to clean our lands from them and everyone like them and again we ask from him to protect all men from them."¹⁸⁵ Then he distinguishes the real Sufis from the *maftunin* by giving a similar categorization with Khwafi. He says, *maftunin* dress the Sufi clothes to conceal their inner and external states from people. This state is opposite of the righteous path."¹⁸⁶ Khwafi, as mentioned in the

¹⁸⁴ Ocak, *Zındıklar ve Mülhidler*, 152-53.

¹⁸⁵ Qudsi, *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, 340.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

related chapter, explains the major aspect of heretics as concealing the real creed from people. Zoroastrians and fire-worshippers seem to abandon their old beliefs externally but they still protect their belief internally. In this way, they deviate people from the true path. Concealing the inner belief is another common aspect that Qudsi and Khwafi ascribed to the heretics.

3. 3. 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi and Ibn 'Arabi

Qudsi follows his sheikh Khwafi on the issue of Ibn 'Arabi. Qudsi mentions a sect that is called *wujud*.¹⁸⁷ As we mentioned in the related chapter, Khwafi was mentioning the same group with the name of *wujudiyan*. People who are referred by Qudsi when he is explaining this sect of *wujud* are followers of Ibn 'Arabi as Khwafi referred the same group under the title of *wujudiyan*. Like Khwafi, Qudsi never directly gives this reference. He never say that the sect of *wujud* is followers of Ibn 'Arabi. However, as we will see in the Chapter 4, attributes Qudsi ascribed them are the same attributes that prominent scholars who criticize Ibn 'Arabi like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun, ascribed to him and his followers. Beside the sameness of terminology, approach of Qudsi is identical with these detractors. Qudsi blames the sect of *wujud* with same faults as these detractors blamed Ibn 'Arabi and his followers.

At first glance, it seems that Qudsi only allocates a short space for this sect, like four lines, before passing on to a discussion of the sect of materialists. However, when we read this passage on the sect of *wujud*, he says, "they are from the lured sects and they support the doctrine of *wujud*. We warned about them in the forth chapter of this book."¹⁸⁸ After that, he makes an interesting claim: "They see the existence of God and people as the same thing, such an extent that one of them answered the question of 'who are you?' as 'I am God!' God is distanced from their sayings."¹⁸⁹ Here, Qudsi clearly criticizes Hallaj Mansur, a Sufi famous for his problematic statement of "*ana al-haqq* (I am truth/God)." He also criticizes Hallaj Mansur and Bayazid Bistami in another chapter. When Qudsi explains the sect of incarnation

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 335.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

(*hululiyya*), he gives the names of these two Sufis by referring to their contradictory statements of “*ana al-haqq*” and “*subhani ma a’zama shani*.”¹⁹⁰ Qudsi suggests these statements are similar to heretical ideas of the sect of incarnation. Qudsi says, “We are far away from them. We reject their statements as we rejected statements of Christians.”¹⁹¹ Prominent scholars of the earlier age, like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun, frequently uses problematic statements of Hallaj Mansur and Bayazid Bistami to show the faults of Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers. According to them, Mansur and Bistami made the same mistakes with Akbaris. These mistakes were unificationism and incarnation.

When we examine the fourth chapter we see a wide place allocated for this sect. Qudsi’s evaluations are quite similar with Khwafi. Qudsi says, it is the sect that defends the absolute unity (*wahda al-mutlaqa*). He says roots of this sect are found in Sufis. Their evidence is what has been heard from the companions of Prophet Muhammad. They say, “God was in the everything I saw”. Some of them say “with”, some say “before” and some say “after” in the place of “in” at the sentence. And some of them say, “I saw nothing but God.” They find evidences from the Noble Quran such as the 58th sura, Mujadila, verse seven. It says, “There is no *Najwa* (secret counsel) of three, but He is their forth, nor of five but He is their sixth.”¹⁹² Their other evidence is the verse that says, “And He is with you, wheresoever you may be.”¹⁹³ Their other evidence is the verse of “And Allah encompasses them from behind!”¹⁹⁴ According to Qudsi, they say, “When we are saying incarnation (*hulul*) and unification (*ittihad*), we do not imply the same meaning with theologians (*mutakallimun*). The meaning of unification refers to statement of “a thing was a single entity and turned into something else.” This is the terminological meaning of it. Then Qudsi gives the true meaning of incarnation and says “Incarnation is only true when it is ascribed to only nature but not God. It is prohibited to ascribe this aspect to God.” Then he says,

¹⁹⁰ We can literally translate the statement as “I glorify me, my glory is the greatest.” Statement is usually used by Muslims to glorify God. However, Bayazid Bistami changed the object of the sentence from God to “I/me”.

¹⁹¹ Qudsi, *Kashf al-I’tiqad*, 284.

¹⁹² Qur’an 58:7.

¹⁹³ Qur’an 57:4.

¹⁹⁴ Qur’an 85:20.

“But some of them said, all created things consisting of animals, plants, and inorganics they transformed from the entity, and the absolute entity is God.” Which means, according to Qudsi some of them included God to the process of incarnation and this is apparently wrong. Qudsi also says that there are two meaning of their words, one is internal and other is external. The external meaning is wrong with respect to sharia and sunna. However, some Sufis refer to the inner meaning. According to them, when a person conducts a true contemplation to himself, he sees nothing but an absolute absence and the existence of the absolute perpetuity. These Sufis see the union in the essence of separation and see the separation in the essence of union. This is the station of Prophet Muhammad.¹⁹⁵

Approach of Qudsi to this sect who believes in the absolute unity and Khwafi’s critics of the sect of *wujudiyan* present a considerable similarity. Firstly, Khwafi explains the faults of the sect of *wujudiyan* by referring to the faults of sophists, materialists, and philosophers. Qudsi, similarly refers to materialist and theologians when he is explaining the faults of the sect who believes in the absolute unity. Qudsi also refers to heresy of incarnation and unification in the same discussion. Secondly, Qudsi distinguishes the Sufis on the right path from the wrong path as Khwafi did. Khwafi reveals this difference by calling them the sect of the *wujudiyan* and the sect of the *muwahhidan-ı haqiqi*. Qudsi does not name them but reveals the same difference. He separates the inner and external aspects of statements of the sect of who believe in the absolute unity and says the inner meaning belongs to some Sufis and their station is the station of Prophet Muhammad. The concern that pushes Qudsi to put such a difference is probably the same as that of Khwafi. Khwafi, as we suggested, puts the difference to distinguish his beloved friend Muhammad Parsa from other problematic Akbari figures in Herat. We know that Qudsi and Molla Fenari are close friends. We know that these two Sufis composed poems for each other.¹⁹⁶ We also know that Molla Fenari’s initiation is most probably to the order of Zayniyya, beside

¹⁹⁵ Qudsi, *Kashf al-I’tiqad*, 285-87.

¹⁹⁶ For these poems see the appendix 4 of Tek’s book. In these verses, two Sufis praise each other greatly. For example, Molla Fenari says for Qudsi, “The most auspicious among people who came to Anatolia” and Qudsi says for Molla Fenari, “Imam of the century, you are unique in science and reason in this age.” Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 316.

other orders. His tombstone typifies the stones of the Zayniyya order. The top of these stones is in the shape of a triangle and becomes thinner at the bottom. Its shape resembles the shape of diamond.¹⁹⁷ A more detailed analysis will be given in the Chapter 5. For now, it should be noted that Molla Fenari is the greatest representative of Akbari School in the Ottoman lands. Qudsi probably puts this difference to distinguish Molla Fenari from the problematic Akbari figures like for example Sheikh Bedreddin.

Qudsi also criticizes Ibn 'Arabi for his alleged contradictions, especially on the subjects of Pharaoh's faith and status of infidels in Hell. Ibn 'Arabi suggests that Pharaoh repents at the last minute before his death and is therefore purified. Ibn 'Arabi also suggests that people in Hell will stay there, but will be given a kind of comfort; they will fall into an eternal sleep and will see beautiful things in their dreams.¹⁹⁸

In *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, when Qudsi explains the names, attributes, and deeds of God, he mentions Pharaoh. He says, "If you ask about the deeds of God, He is in business every day. That means He acts according to his promises and threats. It is said that God does not break his promises and threats." According to Qudsi, people who go off the true path will experience a great suffering in Hell together with Pharaoh.¹⁹⁹ Qudsi claims Pharaoh will stay in hell forever on the contrary of Ibn 'Arabi's claim that suggests Pharaoh died as a believer.

Qudsi also mentions the status of people in Hell later in the chapter. He mentions another lured group (*maftunin*) who suggest that neither body nor soul will suffer in hell. According to him, both body and the soul will suffer in hell.²⁰⁰ In his *Hadi al-Qulub*, Qudsi mentions this evaluation again, and this time he directly criticizes Ibn

¹⁹⁷ Mustafa Aşkar, *Molla Fenari ve Vahdet-i Vücut Anlayışı* (Ankara: Muradiye Kültür Vakfı Yayınları, 1993), 75.

¹⁹⁸ Cağfer Karadaş, "Muhyiddin İbn Arabî'nin İtikâdî," *Tasavvuf İlmi ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 21 (2008): 91-92.

¹⁹⁹ Qudsi, *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, 257.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 283.

Arabi, though without giving his name. He says, “The one who denies the eternal life of infidels in hell and suggests that they will be happy there is wrong.”²⁰¹ The one who suggested this Ibn ‘Arabi.

3. 4. Concluding Remarks

‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi was one of the most important Zayni sheikhs in Anatolia. He was one of the the most influential figures in the tariqa’s expansion.²⁰² He had many important disciples, like Molla Fenari, Sheikh Vefa, and Taceddin İbrahim, and wrote several important books. He followed the approach of his sheikh Khwafi on the issues of the cosmological realms and heresy.

Qudsi, in his *Tuhfa Wahib*, explains the cosmological realms in the same way that his sheikh Khwafi does. On this point, it is significant that he does not follow the framework of the Akbari Sufis. He counts these realms from bottom to top. This means that he perceives these realms as stations that will be experienced by the spiritual seeker. He does not use Akbarian terminology, which consists of terms like nonentification or immutable entities. In this book, difference of Qudsi’s approach from Akbari Sufis is significant. Because, the issue of cosmological realms is directly related with a doctrine peculiar to Akbari Sufis and that is levels of existence (*maratib al-wujud*) or five divine presences (*hazarat al-khams*). The doctrine of cosmological realms is used by both Akbari and non-Akbari Sufis throughout the history. However, when Akbari Sufis explain it they adopt a unique terminology that belongs only to Akbaris. Furthermore, Akbari Sufis explain these levels from top to bottom. This method is used for showing the theophany of God and creation of universe. Non-Akbari Sufis, on the other hand, explain these realms from bottom to top to show the route that will be followed by the spiritual seeker. Inquiry of Qudsi’s *Tuhfa Wahib* was a necessity for my inquiry to understand if Qudsi adopted an approach that is peculiar to Akbari Sufis. If Qudsi had adopted such an approach, our argument of Qudsi was against Akbaris’ doctrines would have become invalid. Qudsi did not adopt

²⁰¹ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 116.

²⁰² Ibid., 35.

the approach or terminology peculiar to Akbaris. He followed his sheikh in this manner.

Qudsi's book *Kashf al-I'tiqad* is a commentary on Khwafi's *Manhaj*. Both address the subject of heresy with the same approach. Khwafi counts four groups for the new heretics. They are the sophists, materialists, philosophers, and sect of *wujudiyan*. Qudsi mentions them in his *Kashf al-I'tiqad* in the same manner as Khwafi, but extends the number of heretics. He counts twenty-one groups, including the four groups above.

Unlike Qudsi, Khwafi uses the term "heretic" (*mulhid*) as the name of heretics throughout the book. Qudsi uses this term, but he more frequently uses the term "lured" (*maftunin*). Usage of this term is interesting since it is the same term used by Ibn Taymiyya when he is mentioning Ibn 'Arabi and his followers as I will show in the Chapter 4. Qudsi follows a similar path to Khwafi in the use of the term *Hurufis*. The term of *Hurufi* is used in a close position to the terms heretic and lured. He counts many names under the category of *Hurufis*, but many of these names have slight common ground with *Hurufis* as the users of the science of letters. For Qudsi and Khwafi, the term *Hurufi* is probably used to connote anyone who deviates from the right path of Islam. In this manner, Qudsi condemns Sheikh Bedreddin as a *Hurufi*. Qasim al-Anwar was banished from Herat with the same accusation. In this banishing, Khwafi's efforts were efficient. Neither Qasim al-Anwar nor Sheikh Bedreddin have a direct link with the *Hurufis*. They do not even use the science of letter. In this context, Qudsi does for Sheikh Bedreddin what Khwafi did for Qasim al-Anwar. It would be wrong to perceive these incidents as a simple calumny made by Khwafi or Qudsi. But it seems like, in the minds of Qudsi and Khwafi, the meaning of the term of *Hurufi* exceeded the word's terminological reference.

Another resemblance shared by Khwafi and Qudsi is their approach to Ibn 'Arabi and his intellectual inheritance. Both express the faults of this school by referring to the materialists and philosophers. Qudsi also draws attention to the sects of unification and incarnation. Neither Qudsi nor Khwafi condemn the Akbari School for heresy

directly, but see it as a dangerous school that may cause heresy. In this manner, they distinguish a group among Sufis who speak of “entity” and proclaim them as “Sufis on the right path.” To be able to understand this demarcation, we should examine the network these two Sufis were a part of. Khwafi probably does this demarcation to distinguish his beloved friend Muhammed Parsa from problematic figures like Qasim al-Anwar and Dervish Samarqandi. Qudsi probably does this demarcation to distinguish his beloved friend and probable disciple Molla Fenari from problematic Akbari figures like Sheikh Bedreddin. In this manner, Qudsi does for Molla Fenari what Khwafi did for Muhammad Parsa.

Both Qudsi and Khwafi criticized certain problematic issues related with Ibn ‘Arabi. Khwafi criticizes Ibn Arabi’s approach to Pharaoh’s faith. Khwafi says that Pharaoh died as an infidel and that he will be punished in hell eternally. Khwafi also opposes Ibn Arabi’s approach to the seal of sainthood. According to Khwafi, Ibn Arabi’s indication that represents himself as the seal of the sainthood is wrong because the seal of sainthood is Muhammad al-Mahdi who will come in the future.

Qudsi criticizes Ibn Arabi’s approach to Pharaoh’s faith in the same way as Khwafi. Qudsi also opposes to Ibn Arabi’s assertion of the happiness of infidels in hell. Beside these criticisms, Qudsi criticizes two more names when he is explaining the *wujudiyan*. He refers to Hallaj Mansur and Bayazid Bisṭami’s problematic statements of “*ana al-haqq*” and “*subhani ma a’zama shani*” and says, “We are distanced from them. We reject their statements as we rejected statements of Christians.”²⁰³ In this part, Qudsi refers to the heresies of incarnation and unification, which is actually a popular method for criticizing Ibn ‘Arabi, his intellectual inheritance, and members of Akbari School. This method will be examined in Chapter 4 in detail.

In an interesting move, Qudsi visits the tomb of Sadr al-Din Qunawi, the most famous representative of the Akbari School, when he went to Konya. He describes his experience at Qunawi’s tomb as follows, “The top of his blessed grave was made of

²⁰³ Qudsi, *Kashf al-I’tiqad*, 284.

a tree in the shape of dome. A branch from this tree caught my skirt and pulled me toward his grave.”²⁰⁴ This mystical experience can be interpreted in two ways. First, it is a prognostication of Qudsi’s settlement in the Qunawi’s lodge for his activities. When Qudsi came to Konya he was looking for a place to settle and carry out his activities. He visited the tombs of three great Sufis, Shams al-Din Tabrizi, Mawlana Jalal al-Din Rumi, and Qunawi. Only in Qunawi’s tomb, he saw a branch that is pulling Qudsi to himself as if Qunawi was calling Qudsi to settle in his lodge.

Secondly and more accurately, when Qudsi came to Konya, firstly he visited the tombs of three masters of the region. In all of these tombs Qudsi saw mystical visions. In the tomb of Qunawi, he saw that a branch pulled him to itself as if Qunawi was pulling Qudsi to his *weltanschauung*. This does not mean that Qudsi adopted the ideas of Akbaris however it means that Qudsi came across with another context. In this new context, Ibn ‘Arabi was not a heretic but the greatest master. His ideas were not regarded as heresy but consistent with sharia and sunna. Here, we should remember, the writing of *Kashf al-I’tiqad* finished in Damascus before Qudsi came to Anatolia. Furthermore, he did not refer to a connection of Ibn ‘Arabi in the names he added on the margins of the book where he mentions the heretics he met during his voyage to Anatolia. Did Qudsi’s ideas on Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers change when he settled in Konya? We do not know for sure, since there is no book that belongs to Qudsi about the subject after he came to Anatolia. However, this mystical experience is a good indicator that shows Qudsi’s changing ideas about Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers.

Qudsi as the representative of Zayniyya in Anatolia seems like a confused figure on the issue of Ibn ‘Arabi. In his books, he follows his sheikh Khwafi and criticizes Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers. However, in his social life he shows intimacy with Akbari figures in Anatolia, excluding apparent heretical figures. His attitude toward Qunawi and Molla Fenari is significant in this sense. Therefore, I suggest that Qudsi was a transitional figure between the harsh stance of his sheikh Khwafi, who was detractor

²⁰⁴ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 550; Taşköprizade, *Shaqa’iq*, 67.

of Ibn 'Arabi, and the positions of his disciple Sheikh Vefa and other Zaynis, who became Akbari Zaynis in Anatolia.

CHAPTER 4

IBN 'ARABI AS A POLEMICAL FIGURE

I examined Khwafi's and Qudsi's criticisms of Ibn 'Arabi in the previous chapter. It is possible to reduce their critics into some certain formulas. First, they both criticize the doctrine of oneness of being (*wahda al-wujud*) without referring to the name of the term or Ibn 'Arabi directly. However, as I suggested many times, in these refutations they used the same terminology and argumentation with the prominent scholars of the earlier period in their refutation of Ibn 'Arabi. Scholars like Ibn Tamiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun became leading detractors of Ibn 'Arabi and frequently referred by later scholars. In this sense, their refutations constituted a tradition of anti-Akbari refutations. Khwafi and Qudsi adopted this tradition by referring to terms of philosophy, unification, and incarnation when they are refuting the doctrine of oneness of being. Hence, absence of name of Ibn 'Arabi or the term of oneness of being does not have much value. They share the same argumentation, same terminology, and same context. Secondly, both Khwafi and Qudsi criticize Ibn 'Arabi's approach of Pharaoh's faith. Ibn 'Arabi claims that Pharaoh died as a believer. Khwafi and Qudsi says that Pharaoh will stay in hell forever and the one who claims that Pharaoh died as a believer is wrong according to Qur'an, Sunna and reason. Thirdly, Khwafi criticizes Ibn 'Arabi's idea of seal of sainthood (*khatm al-walaya*). Ibn 'Arabi claimed, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly, that he is the seal. However, seal of sainthood is Muhammad al-Mahdi according to Khwafi. Fourth, Qudsi criticizes Ibn 'Arabi's approach to state of infidels in hell. Ibn 'Arabi claims that they will find some kind of a comfort in hell. Qudsi says that they will not. The issues of Pharaoh's faith, seal of sainthood, and state of infidels in hell are also parts of the criticisms made by those prominent scholars and frequently used by the followers of the anti-Ibn 'Arabi tradition. Lastly, there is the subject of cosmological levels. This is not a criticism for sure. Neither Khwafi nor Qudsi criticized the doctrine of levels of existence (*maratib al-wujud*) of Akbari Sufis. However, they explained a similar subject; cosmological levels. In their explanation, neither Khwafi nor Qudsi adopted Akbari terminology or approach. Akbari Sufis explain levels of existence as

entification (*ta'ayyun*) and theophany (*tajalli*) processes in which the Absolute Entity passed through. This is the process of creation for them and generally is explained from top to bottom level. However, according to Khwafi and Qudsi cosmological levels constitute a path that will be experienced by spiritual seeker. Accordingly, they explain them from bottom to top level.

In this chapter, I will contextualize refutations of Khwafi and Qudsi by explaining the same titles as used by the initiators of the aforementioned anti-Ibn 'Arabi tradition. I will also include in my contextualization the issue of comparison of sainthood with prophethood since it is also a title used by anti-Ibn 'Arabi scholars and mentioned by Anatolian Zayni Piri Halife, as I will show in Chapter 5. I will explain these formulas by giving the historical context. We will see that these critics made by Khwafi and Qudsi are not invented by them. They follow a significant tradition when they are refuting Ibn 'Arabi. It will be shown that these critics are actually cliché formulas built in the past by the prominent scholars like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani and Ibn Khaldun. And they are the main sources referred when refuting Ibn 'Arabi by many scholars including Khwafi and Qudsi.

I will also give a detailed explanation of the doctrine of levels of existence of Akbari Sufis. This issue is important since first, it will be clear that Qudsi and Khwafi were not following an Akbari tradition when they are explaining the cosmological levels and secondly, Sheikh Vefa who is the outstanding figure in Chapter 5 was following Akbari tradition in his book, *Saz-i 'Irfan* where he is explaining the levels of existence.

4. 1. Polemical Clichés of Ibn 'Arabi

Ibn 'Arabi had been the most controversial Sufi sheikh throughout the Islamic history, beyond any doubt. Debates around him started when he was still alive and his statements seem to be still an attractive topic for Muslim and non-Muslim scholars around the world. Knysh says, "It is not surprising: from the 7th S.H./13th C.E. centuries onward practically every Muslim thinker of note took it upon himself to define his position vis-à-vis the controversial Sufi master." Indeed, any modern scholar who

studies on history of Sufism cannot do it without touching an issue related to Ibn 'Arabi.²⁰⁵

Even though criticisms against Ibn 'Arabi started when he was still alive, debates around him started to intensify around thirteenth century and reached to peak point during fifteenth century. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, there are ten full-scale refutations written against Ibn 'Arabi. And, in the fifteenth century only, we confront with at least nineteen refutations and numberless fatwas against him. In return, throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, pro-Ibn 'Arabi Sufis wrote around ten apologies and ten legal fatwas that defend him.²⁰⁶

It was a hard work to evaluate Ibn 'Arabi's status for scholars and Sufis who criticize him. To claim him an infidel had serious theological problems. For them, Ibn 'Arabi's ideas were very dangerous against the very unity of Islamic community. These ideas were heretical and contrary to the sharia and sunna, which are the bases of community of Islam. Hence, this threat should have been annihilated. However, to claim a Muslim an infidel was also very dangerous. The result of this claim could be ending up in hell for the claimer. In the famous hadith, Prophet Muhammad says, "If somebody accuses another of *fusuq* (by calling him *fasiq*, i.e. a wicked person) or accuses him of kufr (infidelity), such an accusation will revert to him (i.e. the accuser) if his companion (the accused) is innocent."²⁰⁷ That means, if Ibn 'Arabi is not really an infidel than the one who accuses him becomes an infidel. Consequently, the method used by detractors of Ibn 'Arabi in the later period was generally using refutations of early prominent scholars.

Criticisms of these scholars were reduced into some cliché formulas throughout the history. These formulas were used by detractors when refuting Ibn 'Arabi. Eventually, refuting Ibn 'Arabi became a tradition that has its own terminology and argumentation. In this tradition, most outstanding formulas were doctrine of

²⁰⁵ Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 1.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 201.

²⁰⁷ Sahih Bukhari, Book 73 (Al-Adab), Number 71.

oneness of being, Pharaoh's faith, seal of sainthood, and comparison of sainthood with prophethood. I call these topics "polemical clichés" since they are a distorted version of Ibn 'Arabi's authentic ideas. Hence, likewise detractors, followers of Ibn 'Arabi used these topics when defending Ibn 'Arabi's position. So, these topics became polemical and clichés.

As I explained in the previous two chapters, Khwafi and Qudsi were among the users of these cliché formulas. In this thesis, I will use these topics as benchmarks to explain Anatolian Zayni sheikhs' attitude vis-à-vis Ibn 'Arabi. So as to do that, I will contextualize these formulas by examining approach of initiators of this tradition.

4. 1. 1. Oneness of Being (*Wahda al-Wujud*)

Ibn 'Arabi never used the term of oneness of being (*wahda al-wujud*) in his books.²⁰⁸ However, this does not mean that the ascription of oneness of being to Ibn 'Arabi is wrong. The first user of the term is Sadr al-Din Qunawi (d.1274) who is the direct student of Ibn 'Arabi. He uses the term of oneness of being in his at least two passages, however the usage of term was not technical in Qunawi's texts.²⁰⁹ First sufi/scholar who used it as a technical term is Farghani (d.1300), student of Sadr al-Din Qunawi.²¹⁰ First scholar who gives an extensive explanation of the term of oneness of being is 'Abd al-Razzaq Kashani (d.1335).²¹¹ And after him, term was accepted and used by prominent followers of the Akbari School. Afterwards, the term of oneness of being became inseparable from Ibn 'Arabi.

Even though Ibn 'Arabi never used the term of oneness of being, he asserts sentences that would imply the meaning of the term. He frequently discusses about *wujud* and uses terms like *wahda*, *wahdaniyya*, and *ahadiyya*.²¹² However, this usage does not

²⁰⁸ Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 117; Ibn al 'Arabi, *The Meccan Revelations*, vol. 1, 128; William C. Chittick. "Rumi and wahdat al-wujud" in *Poetry and Mysticism in Islam: the heritage of Rumi* [Giorgio Levi Della Vida Conference (11.: 1987: Los Angeles)] edited by Amin Banani, Richard Havannisian, and Georges Sabagh (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 72.

²⁰⁹ Chittick. "Rumi and wahdat al-wujud," 78.

²¹⁰ Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 153.

²¹¹ See Ekrem Demirli, "Vahdet-i Vücûd," DİA.

²¹² Chittick. "Rumi and *wahdat al-wujud*," 72.

refer to meaning that used in the later periods. This term drew the attention of many Sufis and scholars, by both of detractors and followers, in the later period and became focus of debates. Consequently, occurred nuances in the usage of the term and meaning of the term changed within time.

Investigation of usage of the term of oneness of being exceeds the limits of this work. So, his approach on the subject will be explained briefly and will be touched to issues only related to our survey. First of all, it would be wrong to think that Ibn 'Arabi builds a philosophical or theological system. Ibn 'Arabi, in his *Fusus*, says that information regarding *wujud* can only be acquired through theophany (*tajalli*). A person can only understand this theophany through intuition, or in other words unveiling and divine inspiration. Moreover, Ibn 'Arabi asserts that he is not among those who transmit words of philosophers. He says he wrote all his books only as result of unveiling.²¹³

The term of *wujud* as it used by Ibn 'Arabi has direct link to doctrine of oneness of being. However it comes with many difficulties. First, the term of *wujud* has two meanings, "to be found" and "being." Moreover, the first meaning refers to two separate meanings more, first is "to be found" as we mentioned, and the second is "the process of finding." When we put these meanings of the term, then, the term of *wujud* refers four different meanings. First; the term refers to two different meanings when it is translated as "being." First is "God as the Absolute Reality." The second usage of the term is a metaphoric meaning and it refers to "everything beside God (*masiwallah*)." When the term of *wujud* is used as "to be found or process of finding," it refers to two different meanings as well. First is "the finding of God as experienced by God Himself", and the second meaning is "as experienced by the spiritual seeker."²¹⁴

In the first meaning that *wujud* referred, there seems to be a paradox since it refers to both God Himself and everything beside God. This paradoxical situation leaps out

²¹³ Ibid., 74; Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 214-15.

²¹⁴ Chittick. "Rumi and *wahdat al-wujud*," 74-75.

in many places of Ibn 'Arabi's texts. For example, his statements like "Freedom is servitude," "You are servant and you are Lord," and "You are not Him (God), maybe you are Him" confuses the reader. This paradoxical style of Ibn 'Arabi derives from his doctrine of levels of existence (*maratib al-wujud*), which will be examined in the further pages. For now, let us say that one fact in a significant level may not be same in another level of existence. The theophany of a thing changes in each level.²¹⁵ Like these other statements, there is a similar nuance between the meanings of "everything beside God" and "God as the Absolute Reality." According to Ibn 'Arabi, in reality *wujud* only belongs to God. If things other than God exists, that is because God provides them *wujud*. The plurality we perceive in this world is just a phenomenon. In reality they do not exist. More precisely, there is nothing in the existence but the Real. Then, everything other than God is nonexistent in itself, thought it is existent to the extent that it manifests the Real. The created things that are entities (*a'yan*) in themselves posses no existence of their own, in this sense. They are reflections in different accidents like shape, color, smell etc., of the immutable entities (*al-a'yan al-thabita*). The knowledge of immutable entities belongs to God for all eternity. God grants these entities' existence and they appear in the universe. But, as mentioned above, since the entities have existence in themselves, nothing is perceived but *wujud* of God. Chittick explains this difficult situation with the analogy of rainbow. There are many colors in the rainbow but there is only one light. Multiplicity of colors does not negate the oneness of light. On this rainbow, red or blue have no existence in themselves and the only thing that manifests is actually light but with different accidents. Like red and blue on the rainbow, things have no independent existence in this phenomenal world. Their existence is only a mode of *wujud* of God.²¹⁶

Other important aspect of Ibn 'Arabi's approach is *wujud*'s oneness and multiplicity in accordance with God's names of the Hidden (*al-Batin*) and the Apparent (*al-Zahir*). Ibn 'Arabi ranks reality of multiplicity a lot more than the oneness of *wujud*. In this regard, he interprets multiplicity by explaining it as reflections of divine names of

²¹⁵ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 47-48.

²¹⁶ Chittick. "Rumi and *wahdat al-wujud*," 75-76.

God. When explaining multiplicity the terms of incomparability (*tanzih*) and similarity (*tashbih*) are essential. According to Ibn 'Arabi, God in Himself is incomparable with any created thing. It means *wujud* is totally beyond the reach of every created thing and it is the absolutely nonmanifest as a result of God's divine name of Hidden. However, in the Qur'an, it says that God is not only nonmanifest but He is also manifest as a result of His divine name of Apparent. In accordance with this name, God is similar to all things, by means of His other names, He displays the properties of His own attributes in the cosmos. In this sense, God is one in His essence (*dhat*) and many through His names. As a result, it is true that Ibn 'Arabi accepted the approach of "All is He" from other Sufis who lived before him like Hallaj Mansur and Bayazid Bistami with nuances. But this approach is insufficient to express Ibn Arabi's approach. We should complete the sentence with the statement of "All is not He." So, a truer interpretation of Ibn 'Arabi's approach would manifest itself in the statement of "All is He and all is not He."²¹⁷

Conceptualization of the doctrine of oneness of being occurs after Ibn 'Arabi. First user of the term is Qunawi but not in an independent technical term as we mentioned. Even though Qunawi did not use the term of oneness of being as a technical term, his usage of the term of *wujud* helped this conceptualization. Qunawi centralized the term of *wujud* in his texts. In the passages that he uses the term oneness of being, Qunawi's main aim is to explain that oneness of *wujud* does not prevent the multiplicity of its self-manifestations. According to Qunawi, *wujud* is never plural but it manifests itself as diverse, multiple, and plural in the phenomenal world.²¹⁸ It is easy to see here the obvious resemblance between Qunawi's and Ibn 'Arabi's approaches

Among Qunawi's students, Farghani is most probably the most important one in the conceptualization of the term of "oneness of being." Farghani imitates his master Qunawi in his style and approach. He carried the teachings of Akbari School one step further since he was more systematic than Ibn 'Arabi and more explicit than Qunawi.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 76-77.

²¹⁸ Ibid., 78-79.

He employs the term of “oneness of being” approximately thirty times in his Persian commentary of Ibn al-Farid’s *Poem of the Way* (*Nazm al-Suluk* or better known as *al-Ta’iyya*). Farghani has the same approach with his Great Master Qunawi and the Greatest Master Ibn ‘Arabi²¹⁹ in the issue of oneness and multiplicity of *wujud*. The framework that these three names have is the same. However, Farghani makes a contribution by employing the knowledge of God to the framework. According to him, God knows all things in Himself as immutable entities. On the basis of this knowledge, he creates the universe, so the multiplicity occurs. Thereby, a true oneness lies under the multiplicity and diversity in the universe since God as the knower and creator of them is one. Moreover, oneness and multiplicity are both attributes of divine reality. The difference between them derives from the level of existence that they manifest themselves in.

Farghani used the term of oneness of being as the bottom of the three main stages that spiritual seeker experienced. According to him, seeker in the stage of oneness of being contemplates the oneness. In the second and upper stage, seeker contemplates the multiplicity and in the third and highest stage seeker contemplates the harmony oneness and multiplicity. Farghani asserts that there is a higher level however; this stage is only peculiar to Prophet Muhammad.²²⁰

Farghani may have used the term of oneness of being frequently and as an independent term. However, this term still does not refer the meaning it referred in the later periods and Farghani does not use it as a central term when explaining Ibn ‘Arabi’s approach. He uses it as a stage, and the lowest one in the journey of the spiritual seeker. As a conclusive remark, for the first three generations, including Ibn ‘Arabi, of Akbari School the term of oneness of being does not have much of a value. Taking into consideration that the term became the most important and referred term in the later period, the shift that term experienced is very interesting. The

²¹⁹ In the literature of Akbari School, Ibn ‘Arabi is frequently called as *Sheikh al-Akbar* (the Greatest Master), and Qunawi is called *Sheikh al-Kabir* (the Great Master). From now on, we may use these terms without calling them with real names in some phrases.

²²⁰ Ibid., 80-81.

change that the term witnessed should be attributed to its detractors more than its followers.

Before passing to detractors of Akbari School, we should mention Ibn Sab'in (d.1270). Ibn Sab'in was a Sufi who showed great respect to Ibn 'Arabi. He was contemporary of Qunawi. Ibn Sab'in was most probably the source of the term oneness of being as it was understood in the later period. When he is compared with Qunawi, Ibn Sab'in's major references were addressing Sufis of the earlier periods. The philosophical tone that is explicit in Qunawi's books does not exist in Ibn Sab'in's works. Ibn Sab'in shines out as a Sufi master who tries to educate his disciples and tries to give them practical solutions. There are some works that he used a more philosophical tone however this tone is for explanation of his approach. These kinds of arguments are not major or central part of his books. The term of "oneness of being" remarks as a technical term that refers the worldview of saints and Gnostics.²²¹ The difference between him and Qunawi, and Farghani is obvious. Qunawi uses the term to show that multiplicity in this world does not prevent the oneness of being. Farghani uses it as the bottom level for spiritual seeker. Ibn Sab'in uses it in a very close tone to the usage of it in the later periods and it is the worldview of the person who is in the highest level among people, i.e. the perfect man.

Awhad al-Din Balyani (d. 1288) is another important Sufi, who follows Ibn Sab'in via a chain of spiritual order, in establishment of the term of "oneness of being." He is frequently cited for interpreting Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of oneness of being. In his book "Treatise on Unity," the reader confronts with phrases that are examples of Ibn 'Arabi's approach as it is constructed in the later ages. For example, his statement of "By Himself He sees Himself, and by Himself He knows Himself. ... His Prophet is He, and His sending is He, and His word is He."²²² As we see, Balyani's statements resemble a lot the famous Persian phrase *Heme ust* (Everything is Him) that became

²²¹ Ibid., 82-83.

²²² Ibn al-'Arabi [Balyani], "*Whose Knoweth Himself...*," trans. T. H. Weir (London, 1976), p. 4; quoted here from Chittick. "Rumi and *wahdat al-wujud*," 83. (This book was considered as belonging to Ibn 'Arabi until Michel Chodkiewicz proved that it is actually belonged to Balyani. The book was firstly translated into English in 1901 and Weir put Ibn 'Arabi's name as author.)

the main representative phrase to indicate followers of Akbari School in the later period, and especially in the Persian-speaking world since Balyani lived in Shiraz and wrote Persian poems that present his ideas.²²³

This is another important change that comes with Balyani. For Ibn 'Arabi and Qunawi and members of Akbari School that follows this direct chain immediately, multiplicity is as important as oneness of *wujud*. For them, oneness of being represents two aspects of *wujud*; similarity and incomparability. Balyani mentions the subject in a tone that vanishes the nuance between these two aspects. In Balyani's view, essence of *wujud* approaches too much to attributes, accidents of things insomuch that they seem to be almost same things. This is a problem with respect to Ibn 'Arabi's view since incomparability of God is shaded. However, this difference did not prevent ascription of this kind of an approach to Ibn 'Arabi and his direct students. In time, this difference is vanished in the eyes of detractors of Akbari School and they have been treated, and refuted, as if they all have the same approach.

Ibn Taymiyya (d.1328) is probably the most famous scholar, a Hanbali jurist, who is against Ibn 'Arabi and his followers. He is among the users of the term "oneness of being." He uses the term frequently and blames its advocates with infidelity and heresy. According to Ibn Taymiyya, advocates of the doctrine deny three basic principles of Islam; they have no faith in God, in His prophets, and the Judgment Day. They claim that *wujud* of God is identical with the *wujud* of cosmos. That is why cosmos has no creator but itself. Moreover, according to Ibn Taymiyya, advocates of oneness of being think that they know more than prophets about God since they claim things that never have been mentioned by any prophet. Ibn Taymiyya directly mentions Ibn 'Arabi's name in his critics and claim that Ibn 'Arabi sees God and the cosmos identical. In this sense, Ibn Taymiyya uses the term of oneness of being as synonym of unificationism (*ittihadiyya*) and incarnation (*hulul*) and represents the term as if Ibn 'Arabi and Qunawi used it as an independent technical term.²²⁴ As we mentioned, according to Ibn Taymiyya, the meaning of this term, oneness of being,

²²³ Chittick. "Rumi and *wahdat al-wujud*," 83.

²²⁴ Ibid., 85-86.

is nothing but seeing *wujud* of cosmos as identical with *wujud* of God. In this sense, Ibn Taymiyya seems to be not aware of the aspect of incomparability of *wujud* as introduced by both Ibn 'Arabi and Qunawi. Ibn Taymiyya's critic addresses rather the approaches of Ibn Sab'in and Balyani however he introduces this approach as if it belongs to Ibn 'Arabi. Ibn Taymiyya may be the scholar who used the term most frequently. In this sense, he deserves probably more credit than any others in introducing the term as a technical and independent term that becomes central for Akbari School in the later period. However, this central position comes with distortion. After, Ibn Taymiyya, detractors of Akbari School sees the term as synonym with unificationism and incarnation. Advocates of the school accept the term as a major one even though it has never been used by Ibn 'Arabi or Qunawi as it understood in the later periods. By the time of Mullah Jami (d.1492), for advocates of Ibn 'Arabi, term of oneness of being became a central term for indicating the doctrine of Ibn 'Arabi and his immediate students.²²⁵

We briefly discussed above the occurrence of the term of oneness of being and historical process that the term of *wujud* got through. In this section, we will make a further examination on the critics of oneness of being of Ibn 'Arabi. But before that let us repeat briefly; Ibn 'Arabi never used the term of "oneness of being." Qunawi and Farghani are the first ones who use the term. However, they did not use it as the technical term as it understood in the later periods. With respect to Ibn 'Arabi's understanding of *wujud*, multiplicity of *wujud* is as important as its oneness. Incomparability of God's *wujud* is central in his approach. Even though this oneness manifests itself as multiplicity in the phenomenal world, the real aspect of it is oneness. Qunawi and Farghani agree with Ibn 'Arabi. Qunawi uses the term of oneness of being for explaining this prominent aspect of *wujud*. Farghani uses the term to indicate the third and lowest stage that spiritual seeker experienced. Ibn Sab'in and Balyani have major influence on the subject. Ibn Sab'in uses the term of oneness of being as the world-view of the Sufi of the highest rank, i.e. the perfect man. In Balyani's interpretation of the term, multiplicity of *wujud* vanishes and

²²⁵ Ibid., 89.

consequently incomparable character of *wujud* of God becomes shaded. Balyani's approach is mainly used by detractors of Ibn 'Arabi as if it authentically belonged to Ibn 'Arabi. Consequently, Ibn 'Arabi's approach is represented by the motto of *Heme Ust* and his ideas are perceived identical with Hallaj's and Bistami's problematic statements. Leading name among these detractors is Ibn Taymiyya. According to him, Ibn 'Arabi's ideas are identical with those who defend unification and incarnation.

Ibn Taymiyya is the most famous detractor of Ibn 'Arabi. He is the founder of many aforementioned formulas in refuting him. Ibn Taymiyya finds Ibn 'Arabi guilty of seven issues and claims him infidel. First issue is Ibn 'Arabi's view of immutable entities (*'ayan al-thabita*). According to Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn 'Arabi's concept of immutable entities divests God of his role as the Creator and Sustainer of the universe. Because, in this concept, God becomes in need of the immutable entities in order to manifest his perfections and qualities in the phenomenal world.²²⁶ In reality, God needs nothing. Secondly, according to Ibn Taymiyya, seeing every individual thing in the phenomenal world as a manifestation and theophany of *wujud* of God is approving unification and incarnation. This approach finds its roots in doctrines of Christianity. However, it is more dangerous since it hides itself under the image of Islam. To approve these two doctrines is heresy according to Islamic theology. Third, according to Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn 'Arabi asserts that universe is created and maintained according to a definite and preestablished model. To suggest such model clouds God's omnipotence since it limits God's creation with a certain pattern. Forth, Ibn 'Arabi's monistic metaphysics disregards the moral reflection of Islamic revelation since Ibn 'Arabi prefers unveiling and divine inspiration above Islamic scripture. This is a great threat for Islamic community. It most probably damages Islamic community that is built upon legal interpretation of Islamic scripture and causes immorality and insidious polytheism. Correspondingly, according to Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn 'Arabi falsifies true meaning of Islamic Scripture by claiming that these meaning manifested to him by unveiling. However, what he did is nothing but to legitimize his own heretic ideas with a false interpretation. Fifth, Ibn Taymiyya

²²⁶ Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 101.

criticizes Ibn Arabi's insistence on being the seal of the sainthood and sixth; his approach of sainthood is wrong.²²⁷ Lastly, Ibn Taymiyya criticizes Ibn 'Arabi's claim that Pharaoh died as a believer. Last three titles will be examined in the related sections.

Ibn Taymiyya's other critic to the oneness of being is that it damages the true Sufism. Ibn Taymiyya is not against Sufism. He makes a true definition of Sufism as it understood and lived by the pious ancestors (*al-salaf al-salih*). According to this definition, Sufism is an ascetic practice and world-renouncing piety that aims to achieve self-perfection and the purification of soul. The real goal of real Sufis is to gain the knowledge of His command, i.e. sharia and to serve God more perfectly. However, monistic Sufis distort the real goal of Sufism and changes it to "gain knowledge of God's essence."²²⁸ In other words, they pollute authentic Sufism with philosophical explanations. Ibn Taymiyya sees Ibn 'Arabi as a lured (*maftun*) Sufi, and according to him, Ibn 'Arabi's concept of immutable entities and oneness of being is nothing but a delusion.²²⁹

Ibn Taymiyya, in his *The Refutation of the Oneness of Being*, counts synonyms for the term of oneness of being and those who adhere it. According to him, unification (*ittihad*) and absolute unity (*wahda al-mutlaqa*) are synonyms of the term of oneness of being. And according to Ibn Taymiyya, Hallaj, Ibn al-Farid, Ibn 'Arabi, Ibn Sab'in, and Farghani are Sufis who adhere this doctrine.²³⁰ In this sense, Ibn Taymiyya sees no difference between the terms and names above. For him, there is no difference between Ibn Sab'in and Ibn 'Arabi. He gathers them in one big cluster and accuses them with same crimes; infidelity, heresy, and apostasy. He traces ideas of these names back to unification and incarnation approach of Christians and concept of *ma'lumat/ma'dumat* doctrine of Mu'tazila that asserts "things that exist in our

²²⁷ Ibid., 106-07.

²²⁸ Ibid., 87.

²²⁹ Ibid., 94.

²³⁰ Ibid., 90.

knowledge, should be treated as a special category of things, not as pure entities.”²³¹ Ibn Taymiyya, in his *A Letter from the Sheikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyya to the Divine Gnostic Sheikh Nasr al-Manbijji*, finds the roots of monistic philosophy in the *Fusus* of Ibn ‘Arabi. He claims that Ibn ‘Arabi, in his heretic ideas of unification and incarnation, is influenced from the ecstatic ravings of Hallaj and Bistami. Moreover, he claims that, interpretations of later followers of Ibn ‘Arabi were even more perfidious. According to Ibn Taymiyya, first name of these followers is Sadr al-Din Qunawi.²³²

Another prominent scholar who criticize Ibn ‘Arabi is Sa‘ad al-Din Mas‘ud Taftazani (d. 1390). Taftazani is the Greatest Master of the lands under the rule of Timur (d.1405), especially Khorasan and Khorezm. In these lands, his influence had been very efficient in the titles he studies and wrote. Among these titles, there is refutation of Ibn ‘Arabi. His approach to the subject influenced the scholarly consensus of these lands. Detractors of Ibn ‘Arabi followed Taftazani greatly when they were criticizing him.

Taftazani’s refutation of Ibn ‘Arabi shares many similarities with the one of Ibn Taymiyya. Firstly, like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani makes the definition of “true Sufism” and indicates the limits of it. Taftazani is not against Sufism as whole. According to him, Sufism’s main goal is nothing but spiritual and bodily purification. Like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani believes that Ibn ‘Arabi polluted true Sufism with metaphysical and speculative philosophy. Moreover, Taftazani criticizes Ibn ‘Arabi’s emphasis on the unveiling and divine inspiration. He asserts that knowledge derived from unveiling cannot be used as premise of argumentative and logical theorem. However, Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers do that and use their own personal experience as premise of their doctrine of oneness of being.²³³

²³¹ Ibid., 91. See H. S. Nyberg, *Kleinere Schriften des Ibn al-‘Arabi, nach Handschriften in Uppsala und Berlin zum ersten Mal hrsg. und mit Einleitung und Kommentar versehen von H. S. Nyberg* (Leiden: E. J. Brill 1919), 44-56; for a detailed explanation of doctrine of Mu’tazila about the subject.

²³² Knysh, *Ibn ‘Arabi*, 93-94.

²³³ Ibid., 147.

The important figure in Taftazani's critic of Ibn 'Arabi is Taftazani's teacher Adud al-Din Iji (d. 1355). Iji is among the scholars who blames Ibn 'Arabi with unification and incarnation. He advises his students not to learn Makka from the book of "that Maghribi of the dry temperament (*yabis al-mizaj*),"²³⁴ i.e. Ibn 'Arabi. According to Iji, Ibn 'Arabi is an infidel and addicted to hashish. Iji asserts that there are three groups who adhere unification and incarnation. These are respectively Christians, *Nusayriyya*,²³⁵ and the extremist Sufis. Iji addresses Ibn 'Arabi and his followers with the term of these extremists Sufis. However, he separates a group whom he calls "the Sufi monists", and praises them by saying that their only goal is to overcome all duplicity.²³⁶

A part of Taftazani's critics against Ibn 'Arabi show similarity with Ibn Taymiyya, as we mentioned above, and his teacher Iji. Taftazani maintains his ascription of hashish addiction of Ibn 'Arabi. Taftazani quotes from introduction of *Fusus* to demonstrate this addiction. Here, what Taftazani pointed out is Ibn 'Arabi's suggestion that Prophet Muhammad ordered him to write *Fusus*. In other words, for Taftazani, Ibn 'Arabi's knowledge that derived from unveiling constitutes problem. According to Taftazani, this story was a product of Ibn 'Arabi's drug addiction. He cannot distinguish reality from phantasy.²³⁷

Taftazani names Ibn 'Arabi and his followers as "the philosophizing unbelievers and heretics [adhering to] the oneness of being (*al-kafara al-zanadiqa al-wujudiyya al-mutafalsifa*) and ascribe them six problematic position. Respectively, they assert that everything in this world, including the most disgusting things, is God. They believe that God has no existence *in concreto*. They see divine existence and creatures identical and believe that everything in this world is just a delusion. They claim that the unity, which they perceived through their personal experience, is the real state of things. They see themselves equal or above the Prophet of Islam since they claim

²³⁴ Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 148.

²³⁵ An esoteric Muslim group who attributes forth caliph Ali godhood. For this, see Metin Tuncel, "Nusayrîlik," *DİA*.

²³⁶ Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 148.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, 148-49.

things that never been heard from the Prophet about God. Lastly, they make an allegorical and extremist interpretation of Quran in order to legitimize their heretical ideas.²³⁸

As we can see, most of Taftazani's critics on Ibn 'Arabi resemble Ibn Taymiyya's and Iji's approaches. Among these critics, the critic of mystical experience's so-called correspondence to the essence of the things is peculiar to Taftazani. Taftazani recognizes mystical experience of Gnostics. As a result of practice of ascetism, they reach a state that they see nothing but the Absolute Unity (*wahda al-mutlaqa*). They become blind to the multiplicity of the phenomenal world and see only Divine Unity. This kind of vision is granted for the highest level of Sufis by God. However, this vision intoxicates them with some kind of mystical poison that the owner of the vision starts believing that phenomenal world is nothing but an illusion. But, this does not mean that the owner becomes exempt from sharia likewise what they believe does not correspond with the reality, in other words, in reality, cosmos is not identical with God and things have existence in the phenomenal world. The ones who slip to the wrong path here are called as "the Sufi espousers of the oneness of being (*al-wujudiyya al-mutasawwifa*)."

After this point, Taftazani again starts speaking in the shoes of Ibn Taymiyya. According to Taftazani, Sufis who believe in the oneness of being, on the contrary of their predecessors of the right path, pollute truth belief with metaphysical speculation. They use the term of the Absolute Unity not as a subjective experience as true Sufis do, but as the real state of things.²³⁹ In this sense, Taftazani criticizes doctrines of immutable entities and levels of existence of those Sufis of Oneness of Being.

Taftazani suggests that the immutable entities are nothing but a hallucination. According to him, this idea, in reality, belongs to sophists and in conflict with the senses and rational reasoning. Taftazani refutes claims of these Sufis from a logician

²³⁸ Ibid., 149.

²³⁹ Ibid., 149-50.

perspective. Taftazani asserts that, according to the Sufi espousers of the oneness of being, immutable things are fixed in God's knowledge and they reflect in the phenomenal world as concrete things. For Taftazani, this is a logical contradiction since a concrete thing cannot be an abstract thing at the same time.²⁴⁰ Taftazani's critic of levels of existence is a part of his critic on the immutable entities.²⁴¹ Like he did for the issue of immutable entities, Taftazani finds another logical absurdity in *wujudis* doctrine of levels of existence. According to *wujudis*, as Taftazani named them, *wujud* is entified (*ta'ayyun*) by passing through levels of existence and transforms into concrete things.

However, during the process of entification, immutable entities as objects in the knowledge of God transforms into concrete things. According to Taftazani, entification can only occur in the existent things, in their actual and empirical state. This process cannot occur on some abstract entity and transform it into material things. This is a logical absurdity.²⁴² This criticism is actually not different from Taftazani's criticism on the immutable entities. By asserting the later critic, Taftazani manifests that this absurdity prevails for the all system of monistic Sufis, not only for a part of the system as immutable entities.

With respect to Taftazani's refutation of immutable entities and entification, we should assert that, this critic actually does not address to Ibn 'Arabi directly but to his direct students like Qunawi since Ibn 'Arabi did not develop a clear, specific term called as immutable entities and never explained the entification process with a specific categorization as later Akbaris do. Besides, Taftazani keeps quoting from Qunawi's texts when he is criticizing these two titles. However, this does not mean that Taftazani was not against Ibn 'Arabi. That means, Taftazani finds guilty both Ibn 'Arabi and his direct disciples with same crimes of logical absurdity, unificationism, incarnation, and polluting the real Sufism with metaphysical speculation.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 154.

²⁴¹ Relation of immutable entities with the levels of existence will be explained in the related section of this chapter.

²⁴² Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 154.

Beside his attack of doctrine of oneness of being, Taftazani also refutes Ibn 'Arabi's approach of Pharaoh's creed. This issue will be explained in detail in the related section of this chapter.

Ibn Khaldun is another figure who suggests that authentic Sufism does not include mystical philosophy. According to him, there are two accurate ways of Sufism: First is strictly obeying what ordered by sharia; and the second is the way of unveiling and divine inspiration. Ibn Khaldun asserts that both paths lead to the state of happiness. However, one cannot reach it by following the path of philosophical and theological reasoning.²⁴³ Moreover, Ibn Khaldun asserts that monistic Sufis who come in the later period polluted the authentic Sufism with mystical philosophy. The real problem of mystical philosophy for Ibn Khaldun is that it turned Sufism into something opposite of what it originally was. It became an intellectual trend that is hard to comprehend and something is cannot help immediate needs of Muslims, which is the ultimate goal of authentic Sufism. According to Ibn Khaldun this authentic Sufism is nothing but helping Muslims for the performance of all demands of the divine law.

For Ibn Khaldun, the ones who defends oneness of being are called as monistic Sufis and their assertion of "Everything is One" ground on the Greek Philosophy before Aristo, especially Plato and Socrates. Like monistic Sufis, those philosophers, too, asserted that unveiling can be a premise for the logical and rational theorem and that the knowledge derived from inspiration is universal.²⁴⁴

Like, Ibn Taymiyya and Taftazani, Ibn Khaldun blames Ibn 'Arabi and his followers with unification and incarnation.²⁴⁵ In this sense, he follows them. There is no originality in his critic of unification and incarnation.

Ibn Khaldun also attacks to the doctrine of levels of existence as he thought asserted by Ibn 'Arabi. However, the pattern that is attacked by Ibn Khaldun was originally

²⁴³ Ibid., 187-88.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., 189.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 189-90.

belong to Farghani, who is disciple of Qunawi and this pattern was an interpretation of Ibn 'Arabi's original ideas with the framework of Avicennan ontology.²⁴⁶

Ibn Khaldun also criticizes Ibn 'Arabi's approaches of seal of sainthood and comparison of sainthood with prophethood. This issue will be explained in the related section of this chapter.

As is seen, Ibn Khaldun attacks Ibn 'Arabi and his followers in similar titles with Taftazani and Ibn Taymiyya. Same charges he ascribe them and the same epithets he names them; heretic ideas of unification and incarnation and names like monistic Sufis and mystical philosophers. Most probably, by the time of Ibn Khaldun, the charges of unification and incarnation were frequently ascribed for the members of Akbari School.

Three scholars, Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun, seem to constitute the basic formulas for refuting Ibn 'Arabi. As common points, all three of them blame Ibn 'Arabi and his followers with unification and incarnation. Moreover, they commonly assert that Ibn 'Arabi polluted the authentic Sufism with philosophy. The approach of *wujud* which they attacked is not a true reflection of Ibn 'Arabi's approach, it is further an amalgam of other Sufis like Hallaj and Ibn Sab'in. Still, the detractors of Ibn 'Arabi attacked Ibn 'Arabi's approach of *wujud* mostly by following these three prominent scholar's critics, in the later periods. Especially, ascription of unification and incarnation were widely used.

4. 1. 2. The Faith of Pharaoh

Ibn 'Arabi's approach of faith of Pharaoh had been one of the most problematic issues throughout the history of Sufism. Ibn 'Arabi asserted that Pharaoh died as a believer. In his assertion, he claims that there is no verse in the Qur'an that says Pharaoh will be punished. This claim, which reserves only a couple of pages in *Fusus*, started furious. Even though, we chose the issue as a benchmark that manifests a Sufi's attitude toward Akbari School, like any other subject, this issue is not an absolute

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 190.

wall that separates all the Akbari Sufis from anti-Ibn 'Arabi scholars and Sufis. With other words, it is hard to say that all Akbari Sufis agreed with Ibn 'Arabi in the issue of Pharaoh's faith. Some Akbari Sufis did not agree with Ibn 'Arabi and asserted their ideas freely. However, it is still an estimable benchmark since we can conveniently say that all detractors of Ibn 'Arabi who write about the issue criticized him and all Sufis who defended Ibn 'Arabi on the issue were Akbari.

At the heart of the debate there is the Sura of Jonah, Verse 90, of Qur'an. It says, "We took the Children of Israel across the sea: Pharaoh and his hosts followed them in insolence and spite. At length, when overwhelmed with the flood, he said: "I believe that there is no god except Him Whom the Children of Israel believe in: I am of those who submit (to Allah in Islam)."²⁴⁷ In the verse, it says, at the very last moment, Pharaoh changed his mind and started to believe in God. However, the problem is that there is no verse that indicates his status in the afterlife. The general opinion of the scholars is that Pharaoh's faith was a faith at the last moment and a faith of desperation (*iman al-ya's*). It was not an authentic faith. In the tradition that accepted by the large amount of ulema and Sufis, it is told that the angel Azrael filled Pharaoh's mouth with soil or clasped his lips with his fingers so he cannot fulfill the testimony and gain the divine compassion.²⁴⁸ Ibn 'Arabi was well aware of this tradition and knew that it was generally accepted that Pharaoh will be punished eternally in the hereafter. However, since there is no verse that indicates Pharaoh's status in the hereafter, Ibn 'Arabi interpreted the verse with his exegesis method and with the help of unveiling and inspiration he concluded that Pharaoh died as a believer.

The issue of Pharaoh's faith takes place in the twenty-fifth chapter of *Fusus*, which is devoted to Prophet Moses. According to Ibn 'Arabi, Pharaoh was not sure if he would die at that moment when he was fulfilling his testimony. So, according to Ibn 'Arabi, Pharaoh's faith is not a faith of desperation but a voluntarily faith. In the issue of

²⁴⁷ Qur'an 10:90.

²⁴⁸ Carl W. Ernst, "Controversy Over Ibn 'Arabi's *Fusus*: The Faith of Pharaoh," *Islamic Culture* LIX (July 1985): 259; Eric Ormsby, "The Faith of Pharaoh: A Disputed Question in Islamic Theology," *Studia Islamica* 98/99 (2004): 13.

validity of faith of Pharaoh, Ibn 'Arabi asserts three evidences. First is Pharaoh's daughter prognosticates that baby Moses will be a reason of compassion for Pharaoh. Secondly, Ibn 'Arabi asserts that Pharaoh's conversion was inspired by the magicians who accept prophethood of Moses. And lastly, there is no verse in the Qur'an that clearly indicates Pharaoh will be among the damned in the hereafter. Ibn 'Arabi concludes that God's mercy is encompassing and embraced for Pharaoh as well. Moreover, the phrase in the verse, "Whom the Children of Israel believe in" shows that Pharaoh also accepts prophethood of Moses.²⁴⁹

The issue of Pharaoh's faith was probably the mostly used argument in detracting and defending Ibn 'Arabi. Ormsby counts twenty names dated from 1240 to 1883 who debate about the subject from both sides.²⁵⁰ Seven of these names are pro-Ibn 'Arabi and defended him. However, all of them did not agree with Ibn 'Arabi in every detail. For example, Kashani, the disciple of Qunawi, agrees with Ibn 'Arabi about the faith of Pharaoh, however, he also says Pharaoh will probably suffer for some time in hell for his crimes against Israelites.²⁵¹ Kayseri (d.1350), a famous Akbari Sufi in Anatolia, on the other hand, in his exegesis of *Fusus* agrees with his Greatest Master completely.

Ibn Taymiyya is among the scholars who criticize Ibn 'Arabi's approach of faith of Pharaoh. The last chapter of his *The [True] Reality of the Teachings of Those Who Espouse the Doctrine of Incarnation* is assigned to this subject.²⁵² In this part, he says that Pharaoh's faith is not accepted since it is the faith of desperation.

Ibn Taymiyya's critic is very short when it is compared with Taftazani's. In the related chapter of his *Pamphlet on the Oneness of Being (Risala fi Wahda al-Wujud)*, Taftazani starts with taxonomy of the heretics. In this taxonomy, the worst group is called as *zanadiqa*. These people, according to Taftazani, show themselves as a true

²⁴⁹ Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 159-60; Ernst, "Controversy Over Ibn 'Arabi's *Fusus*," 261; Ormsby, "The Faith of Pharaoh," 11.

²⁵⁰ Ormsby, "The Faith of Pharaoh," 27-28.

²⁵¹ Ernst, "Controversy Over Ibn 'Arabi's *Fusus*," 262.

²⁵² Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 96.

believer of sharia but inwardly they have heretic ideas. Ibn 'Arabi is included in this group.²⁵³ The evidence that Taftazani pursued about the heresy of Ibn 'Arabi is his approach of Pharaoh's faith. According to Taftazani, it was certain that Pharaoh embraced the true belief only when he faced with an absolute death. Furthermore, his testimony was perfunctory and only an imitation of established custom of Israelites. Moreover, Pharaoh did not outwardly accept the prophethood of Moses. This kind of testimony had no value in the Day of Judgment. Taftazani asserts that approving Pharaoh's faith is contrary to Qur'an and ideas of experts of the Sacred Law since in many verses in Qur'an, Pharaoh is mentioned with bad attributes. Ibn 'Arabi, by claiming that, negates the very fundamentals of Islam and Sunna of Prophet. He is among the infidels just like Pharaoh and his people.²⁵⁴ These experts Taftazani mentioned are most probably Mu'tazilite commentator of Qur'an Zamakhsari (d.1144) and Ash'arite theologian and commentator of Qur'an Fakhr al-Din al-Razi (d.1209). Two famous scholars who lived before Ibn 'Arabi became prominent references in the status of Pharaoh. Both agreed that Pharaoh's faith was the faith of desperation and is not accepted.²⁵⁵

Debates did not finish with these names of course. In the Ottoman lands and other Islamic geographies it is possible to find hundreds of books and pamphlets about the issue. We can count Ibn Taymiyya and Taftazani among the names that established the line of detraction in this issue. If we remember, Khwafi and Qudsi are also among the Sufis who participated the debate. Khwafi said that, the controversial part in *Fusus* and *Futuhat* is the part that Ibn 'Arabi asserted that Pharaoh died as a believer. The subject was a problematic issue between Khwafi and his controversial disciple Samarqandi. Qudsi criticized Ibn 'Arabi's approach, too.

²⁵³ Ibid., 159.

²⁵⁴ Ibid., 160-61.

²⁵⁵ Ormsby, "The Faith of Pharaoh," 9-10, 13.

4. 1. 3. Seal of Sainthood (*Khatm al-Walaya*) and Comparison of Sainthood with Prophethood

The concept of seal of sainthood is created by inspiring from the concept of seal of prophethood (*khatm al-anbiya*). Seal of prophethood is the attribute of Prophet Muhammad as the last prophet. Being the seal of something means being the last and the best representative of that thing. So, Prophet Muhammad is the last and the best representative of prophethood. In this sense, many Sufis used the term of the seal of sainthood. Ibn 'Arabi is among them and he claims that he is the seal of sainthood.

When detractors of Ibn 'Arabi are criticizing his approach of seal of sainthood they frequently assert that Ibn 'Arabi is influenced by Tirmidhi (d. 932) who lived almost two hundred years before Ibn 'Arabi and a prominent Sufi famous with his ideas about sainthood. Tirmidhi is the inventor of the term of seal of sainthood²⁵⁶ and he influenced many Sufis. According to Tirmidhi, the seal of sainthood is the counterpart of the sainthood of prophethood. The seal of sainthood will appear physically in the Judgment Day, just like Prophet Muhammad appeared as the last Prophet. However, the last saint as the seal of saints is actually determined firstly by God just as Prophet Muhammad is the first of the prophets.²⁵⁷ In this sense, Tirmidhi ascribe both the seal of prophets and the seal of saints with similar and sometimes exact same attributes. To separate them, in some phrases, is impossible. However, when Tirmidhi made taxonomy on the levels of prophets and saints, the difference of seal of sainthood appears. According to this taxonomy, the seal of saints falls into the level between prophets and saints. He is the culmination of saints and the commencement of prophets.²⁵⁸

Ibn 'Arabi follows Tirmidhi in the subject of the seal of sainthood. Like Tirmidhi, he claims that both seal of saints and prophets are pre-existent. Furthermore, Ibn 'Arabi adds that all saints receive their inspiration from the seal of saints. However, he

²⁵⁶ Masataka Takeshita, "Ibn 'Arabi's Theory of the Perfect Man and Its Place in the History of Islamic Thought" (PhD diss., The University of Chicago, 1986), 145.

²⁵⁷ Ibid.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 147.

differs from Tirmidhi with respect to the concept of sainthood. According to Ibn 'Arabi, there are two types of seal of sainthood: the seal of Muhammadan sainthood and the seal of general sainthood. The latter is Jesus who will appear as Mahdi before the Judgment Day. He will not come as a prophet but as a saint and there will be no other saint after him. In this sense, Ibn 'Arabi's seal of general sainthood is same with Tirmidhi's seal of sainthood. The Muhammadan saints, according to Ibn 'Arabi are those who follow the heart of Prophet Muhammad. They differ from general sainthood. Ibn 'Arabi asserts that this seal is contemporary of him. He lives in Ibn 'Arabi's time. Ibn 'Arabi sometimes asserts that he himself is the seal and sometimes says that he met with seal in Fez, but does not give his name.²⁵⁹

The first Sufi/scholar who criticized Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of the seal of sainthood is Ibn 'Abd al-Salam (d.1262). His *Epistle on the [Saintly] Substitutes and the [Supreme] Succor (Risala fi'l-abdal wa'l-ghawth)* is a belittlement of complete idea of hierarchy of saints that asserts God sustains and protects world by means of these unseen men. According to Ibn 'Abd al-Salam, "Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of seal of sainthood is wrong since there is no proof with respect to Islamic Scripture and hadiths. The first who mentioned this doctrine is Tirmidhi and he influenced many Sufis. All Sufis who mentions about this issue claimed that he himself is the seal of sainthood. Ibn 'Arabi is one of them."²⁶⁰

Ibn Taymiyya is another prominent scholar who criticized Ibn 'Arabi's seal of sainthood. According to him, this doctrine belittles God's prophets and messengers. It also humiliates God's authentic saints, which are as we mentioned who lived during the earlier periods and do not pollute the Sufism with mystical philosophy. Furthermore, this doctrine is very dangerous for the Islamic community since it legitimizes the claims of political messianic movements.²⁶¹

Ibn Khaldun's criticism of the seal of sainthood is not limited to only Ibn 'Arabi's approach. He starts his criticism firstly with deliberation of the concept of saints. Ibn

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 167-68.

²⁶⁰ Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 72-73.

²⁶¹ Ibid., 107.

Khaldun builds an analogy between saints of Sufism and innocent imams of Shiism. He suggests that in the earlier period of Sufism, Sufis are influenced by the conception of Shiism's imamate and they built the concept of sainthood. In the later period, some Sufis shared the doctrine of militant messianic teachings of extreme Shiite movements by depending on the concept of sainthood. Consequently, he criticizes Ibn 'Arabi's seal of sainthood by resembling it to the Mahdi of Shite. As an important detail, Ibn Khaldun never refer to *Futuhāt* or *Fusus* of Ibn 'Arabi in his refutation. He mainly criticizes a changed version of Ibn 'Arabi's approach mostly a version that interpreted by a Ibn Abi Watil who denominated by Ibn Khaldun as a strict follower of Akbari School.²⁶²

As we mentioned, Khwafi is among the Sufis who criticize Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of seal of sainthood. Khwafi asserts that Ibn 'Arabi's claim that represents himself as the seal of the sainthood is wrong because the seal of sainthood is Muhammad al-Mahdi who will come in the future. With this approach, Khwafi seems to be accepting Tirmidhi's approach and against Ibn 'Arabi's seal of Muhammadan sainthood.

Like the issue of seal of sainthood, Ibn 'Arabi is influenced from Tirmidhi in the comparison of sainthood with prophethood, too. Before the comparison of sainthood with prophethood, Tirmidhi makes a detailed taxonomy on the saints. The highest rank in this taxonomy belongs to those what Tirmidhi called as *muhaddathun*. They are the chief of saints and their real rank is between the prophets and saints which means they are higher than saints and lower than prophets. According to Tirmidhi there are many similarities between them. Tirmidhi also makes distinction between prophets and messenger. Prophets are those who assigned by God to lead people the true way. Messengers are those who have the same task but also given a holy book. According to Tirmidhi, Messengers, prophets, and *muhaddathun* are in the same cluster and their rank from top to lower is messenger, prophet, and *muhaddathun*.²⁶³ Even though, the difference between prophets and *muhaddathun* is very obscure, a major difference is in the attribution of their words. According to Tirmidhi, when

²⁶² Ibid., 192-93.

²⁶³ Takeshita, "Ibn 'Arabi's Theory of the Perfect Man," 135-36.

prophet speaks, this is called revelation (*wahy*) and learned from directly the Holy Spirit. However, when *muhaddathun* speak, it is called *hadith* and comes from the faculty of *sakina* in heart. Source of both words are same, i.e. God, however, the way they are acquired is different. This difference causes a further and more important contrast. If one rejects what prophet brought from God, he becomes an infidel, however, if he rejects what *muhaddathun* said, he does not become an infidel.²⁶⁴ Accordingly, a saint of the highest rank can never reach the rank of the lowest prophet.²⁶⁵ Even though Tirmidhi stated their rank clearly, he is often criticized harshly by the later scholars with the accusation of he thinks the saints are superior to prophets.

While Ibn 'Arabi is following Tirmidhi in many respects, he also develops a unique approach. Firstly he divides prophethood into two subcategories.²⁶⁶ First is the special, legislative prophethood that last of this kind is Prophet Muhammad. The second is the general and absolute prophethood that will continue until the Day of Judgment.²⁶⁷ Ibn 'Arabi puts this nuance for protecting the uniqueness of Prophet Muhammad. As another difference, Ibn 'Arabi explains prophethood and sainthood as faculties that can be found within a person. This person can only be a prophet though. In this sense, Ibn 'Arabi, in his *Futuhat*, asserts that sainthood is comprehensive and general. God chooses his prophets and messengers among his saints.²⁶⁸ However, this is not to meant that saints are superior to prophets. In this point, comes the different approach of Ibn 'Arabi from Tirmidhi. Ibn 'Arabi clearly asserts that the superiority of sainthood can only be perceived within a prophet. In the prophet, his faculty of sainthood is superior to his prophethood.²⁶⁹ Furthermore, a saint that follows Prophet Muhammad can never be superior to him.²⁷⁰ The source

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 141.

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 143.

²⁶⁶ This categorization is not the taxonomy of Messenger and prophet. Though, Ibn 'Arabi also agrees with it.

²⁶⁷ Takeshita, "Ibn 'Arabi's Theory of the Perfect Man," 166.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., 123.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., 164-65.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 124.

of knowledge they acquired maybe same however a Muslim saint is obliged to obey Prophet Muhammad since if he does not, he becomes an infidel.

In the later periods, detractors of Ibn 'Arabi criticized his comparison of sainthood with prophethood. As in the previous clichés, they attacked a degenerated version of his approach. They ignored or were not aware of the nuances. They attacked him as if he claimed that saints are superior to prophets. However, as we explained, what Ibn 'Arabi claimed was quite different. Consequently, followers of Akbari School, frequently explained the real approach of Ibn 'Arabi and defended him to allegations.

4. 1. 4. State of Infidels in Hell

The issue of state of infidels in hell did not become a furious issue of debate as previous titles. One reason of this maybe, before Ibn 'Arabi, a respected scholar Imam Ghazzali asserted ideas about the issue that resembles Ibn 'Arabi's ideas. Khwafi did not speak on the issue. Qudsi indirectly claimed that Ibn 'Arabi was wrong. I included the subject in this chapter since, Qudsi and an Anatolian Zayni sheikh, Kutbüddin İzniki, spoke of the issue. Evaluation of İzniki will be mentioned in Chapter 5. In this section, I will briefly explain approach of Ibn 'Arabi and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d.1350) who is probably earliest critic of Ibn 'Arabi about the issue.

Ibn 'Arabi accepts the eternality of hell. However, he claims that everyone who enters hell will go out eventually except four groups: The arrogant, polytheist, atheist, and hypocrites. Ibn 'Arabi claims that, God's Divine mercy will prevail these four groups who commit the greatest sins even if they stay in hell forever.²⁷¹ God's divine mercy that encompasses all is the central issue of Ibn 'Arabi's evaluation of state of infidels in hell. As the result of His mercy the torment of infidels will end eventually. According to Ibn 'Arabi, God's name of Mercy the All Merciful (*Rahman*) encompasses everything including his other names like the Avenger (*al-Muntaqim*). As a result of that, punishment will end for the inhabitants in hell in 50.000 years.²⁷² After this

²⁷¹ Mohammad Hassan Khalil, "Muslim Scholarly Discussion on Salvation and the Fate of 'Others'" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2007), 88.

²⁷² Ibid., 95.

duration, God's name of the All Merciful will manifest itself completely. According to Ibn 'Arabi, when the inhabitants in hell abandoned their hope of leaving hell and surrendered themselves to their fate, their torment will start to turn into some kind of a sweetness. At the end of this process, fire in which they are burning and suffering will get cooler and they will become happy in the end.²⁷³ Another happiness that will be experienced by the inhabitants of hell is that they will start seeing beautiful dreams after God's name of the All Merciful manifested itself completely.²⁷⁴

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyyah is probably the earliest critic of Ibn 'Arabi about the issue. He argues ideas of various Sufis and scholars about the issue and criticizes them under six titles. Second name among the Sufis and scholar who are wrong about the issue is Leader of unificationism (*imam al-ittihadiyya*) as named by Ibn Qayyim. According to him, Ibn 'Arabi is wrong in his claim that asserts inhabitants in hell will start feeling pleasure after a point. Ibn Qayyim agrees with Ibn 'Arabi in his claim of the non-eternality of the torment however he sees Ibn 'Arabi's position extremist. Ibn Qayyim says that Ibn 'Arabi's claim is inconsistent with message of Prophet Muhammad.²⁷⁵

4. 1. 5. Doctrine of Levels of Existence (*Maratib al-Wujud*) of Akbari School

The purpose of this thesis is not to illuminate the cosmological doctrine of Akbari School. Since it is very complex and out of the limits of this work, I will not discuss the doctrine. Though, it is important to know that the doctrine of levels of existence is an integral part of the doctrine of oneness of being. The doctrine of levels of existence explains the very structure and creation of cosmos. The terms of theophany (*tajalli*) and entification (*ta'ayyun*) are essential. In the eyes of Ibn 'Arabi and his followers, being or existence is peculiar to God only. Other things exist in a cognitive way. In the end, existence of everything else is the existence of God's own being. In reality, there cannot be two existences. So, other things are actually theophany of real oneness.²⁷⁶

²⁷³ Ibid., 98.

²⁷⁴ Karadaş, "İbn Arabî'nin İtikâdî," 92-93.

²⁷⁵ Khalil, "The Fate of Others," 149-50.

²⁷⁶ William C. Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences: From Al-Qunawi To Al-Qaysari," *The Muslim World* 72, no. 2 (April 1982): 108.

In the formation of these cognitive things, they pass through different levels of existence and finally reach to this world. In each level, they experience a new process of entification and change. They finally get into shape that as we, human beings, perceives them to be.

On the contrary of issues above, this doctrine has not been a cliché formula to refute members of Akbari School. It is certainly criticized by the detractors of Ibn ‘Arabi, however, it is criticized not as an isolated issue but as an integral part of the doctrine of oneness of being. The reason of mentioning this topic in this thesis is that, not the disapproval, but the approval of the issue proves the intimacy with Akbari School. So, within the opposite perspective it can be used as a benchmark that demonstrates a Sufi’s affinity with Akbari School.

The doctrine of levels of existence, or chain of being, dates long ago before Ibn ‘Arabi. Kılıç, in his detailed inquiry, asserts that in the mythology of many cultures and books of scholars from a wide variety of religions, ideas close to levels of existence exist.²⁷⁷ Furthermore, neo-Platonic philosopher Plotinus’ theory of emanationism is seen as the source of Ibn ‘Arabi in levels of existence by the detractors. When Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, Ibn Khaldun were claiming that Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers polluted the authentic Sufism with philosophy, their main argument was the resemblance of Plotinus’ emanationism with Ibn ‘Arabi’s levels of existence. Aristo and Platon, and their successors in Islamic world, like Avicenna, also speak of similar approaches.²⁷⁸

Ibn ‘Arabi frequently claims that in the ideas of scholars before him, Muslim or non-Muslim, may have parts that correspond with the truth. The resemblance between his approach and approach of those before him is clear. However, he also criticizes them. He changes the parts that he saw wrong and adds new parts to their ideas. In the issue of levels of existence this is what happens. However, the issue of levels of existence that had been mentioned frequently in his *Futuhat* and *Fusus* does not have a framework. It is not mentioned in a systematical way. As any other subject

²⁷⁷ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 98.

²⁷⁸ Ibid., 164-65.

mentioned by Ibn 'Arabi, the doctrine of levels of existence is mentioned disorderly and with respect to its connections to other subjects. Systematization and bringing framework to Ibn 'Arabi's ideas starts as of 14th century with Ibn 'Arabi's direct disciple Qunawi and his disciples.²⁷⁹

Consequently, the doctrine of levels of existence becomes an integral part of ideas of Akbari School. Even though the levels of existence reminds the related ideas of those before Ibn 'Arabi, after this systematization periods, we see that Ibn 'Arabi's approach diverges from them with many respects. For example, the first level of existence, i.e. the level of nonentification (*la ta'ayyun*) does not exist in the approach of Aristo, Plato, Avicenna, and Plotinus. In their ideas, top level is the level of first entification (*ta'ayyun al-awwal*) or level of second entification (*ta'ayyun al-thani*) with respect to Ibn 'Arabi's terminology.²⁸⁰

Eventually, the idea of levels of existence, as Ibn 'Arabi and his followers systemized it, is accepted as the main method for comprehending cosmos and perceived as an inseparable part for the doctrine of oneness of being by both of detractors and followers of Akbari School.²⁸¹ Ibn Khaldun, for example, denominates the followers of Ibn 'Arabi as the people of theophany (*ahl al-tajalli*).²⁸²

In aforementioned systematization period, early followers of Akbari School like Qunawi, Farghani, and Kayseri, made different taxonomies with three, four, five, six, seven, and even forty names of levels of existence.²⁸³ It should be noted that, the difference between these different taxonomies does not imply a fundamental discrepancy. The difference arises from different uses of terminology. The scheme and process of entification does not change. For example, when the taxonomy with seven levels is presenting a more detailed explanation, taxonomy with four levels

²⁷⁹ Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), 280; Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences," 153.

²⁸⁰ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 165.

²⁸¹ Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences," 153; Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 13-14.

²⁸² Semih Ceyhan, "Tecellî," DİA.

²⁸³ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 260.

gives a more general perspective. Discussing all taxonomies and their disparity from each other exceeds the limits of this work.²⁸⁴ I will only mention the taxonomies with four, five and seven levels. I will explain the taxonomy with seven levels since it is the most ordered version of this system. This taxonomy will be the basis of my evaluation. I will mention the taxonomy with five levels of Qunawi shortly since Qudsi's disciple Sheikh Vefa used it in his *Saz-i 'Irfan*. After that, I will mention the taxonomy with four levels so as to it is the one used by Qudsi. I will mention this to clarify my argument on Qudsi that Qudsi did not adopt an Akbari stance when he is mentioning this four-layered taxonomy.

The taxonomy with seven levels has not been used by Ibn 'Arabi and any of second and third generations of Akbari School like Qunawi, Farghani, and Kayseri. However, they all mentioned the names of these seven levels. In some taxonomies for example, in Qunawi's, the level of first entification and second entification are accepted as one level but Qunawi still gave their names separately. That is why I chose to explain seven levels in detail. Even if this taxonomy does not correspond with any of these second and third generation Akbaris, it still gives the names of layers mentioned by all of them. So, according to this taxonomy there are seven levels in the entification process of God. These are respectively; the level of nonentification, the level of first entification, the level of second entification, the level of souls, the level of Imaginative Similitudes, the Level of Witnessing, and the Level of Man.

A) The Level of Nonentification (*La Ta'ayyun*): Ibn Arabi uses many terms to identify this level, such as *kanz-i makhfi*, *majhul-i al-dhat*, *majhul-i muṭlaq*, *ghayb al-ghuyub*, *ghayb al-majhul* etc. This level is actually cannot be count as a level like others. The absolute entity shows no entification yet. This is a place excluded from any type of condition and restriction. There are no obedience, no rebellion, no freedom, no servitude, no death, no life, no day, and no light in this level. There is only Him. However, He has no name, no attribute, and no deeds. That is why the only way to refer Him in this level is through His *salbi* attributes²⁸⁵. Because He cannot be known

²⁸⁴ For a detailed discussion of all levels please see Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences."

²⁸⁵ These are the attributes peculiar to only God.

in this level. All entifications and relations melted and vanished in His entity. However, the ones who make an absolute negation and limit Him with only his *salbi* attributes commit polytheism. Because, in this way, they do not accept His condescension, deeds, and *thubuti* attributes²⁸⁶. There are two types of theophany of God. These are invisible theophany (*tajalli-i ghayb*) and visible theophany (*tajalli-i shahadat*). First absent and present manifestation of oneness that is located in the '*ama*'²⁸⁷ is called as the most holy effusion (*fayd-i aqdas*). In this manifestation, forms exist potentially. This is not the first entification but like a first move in the way of entification. It can be called as a rational entification. It does not exist in reality. It does not have an existence in the sensation. These rational essences transforms into immutable entities (*'ayan-i thabita*)²⁸⁸ in the next step. For them to be able to transform into next level the process of the holy effusion (*fayd-i muqaddas*) is necessary. The reason of the first step, in other words, first theophany of the essence of oneness is the Love of God. This Love is also the reason of first move according to Ibn Arabi.²⁸⁹

B) The Level of First Entification (*Ta'ayyun al-Awwal*): Ibn 'Arabi uses many terms to identify this level such as *ruh-i kulli*, *imam-i mubin*, *al-maddat al-ula* etc. According to Ibn 'Arabi, another name given for this realm is the perfect man (*insan-i kamil*)²⁹⁰.

²⁸⁶ These attributes exist in human beings. However, they are found in God perfectly and interminably. See the article of "Sifat" in DİA for further information.

²⁸⁷ Word's lexical meaning is an intense and dark or light and thin cloud. However, Sufis use the term in a different meaning. According to them this is the realm of oneness. In this realm, no one but God himself knows Himself. According to record, companions of Prophet Muhammad asks him "Where was Allah before He created everything?" Prophet answers, "He was in the '*ama*', there was no air above or underneath of it." Everything beside God is created here and from it. It is the very breath of God. And it is the essence of everything except God. This is also the realm of immutability (*thubut*) since form of everything exists here. For this, see Süleyman Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri Sözlüğü* (İstanbul: Kabaıcı, 2016), 38-39.

²⁸⁸ They are the forms of things located in the knowledge of God. Each entity has a form in God's eternal and stable knowledge. God knows things and universe before He created with respect to their past, present, and future. Things and events take shape according to these immutable entities. For this, see Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 54.

²⁸⁹ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 241-245.

²⁹⁰ In the terminology of Sufism, this person is honored with all names and attributes of God, which means he gathered all the levels of existence in himself. This perfect human is the eye of God and divine light of the universe. He is the mirror of God's essence, names, and attributes. He is like the form of God and God is like his soul. For this, see Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 188.

When the absolute entity descended one step down, i.e. one realm down, it changes form with respect to the qualifications of that realm. Real entitification starts with this second level, which is called the level of first entification. In this level, entitification starts with the process that oneness (*ahadiyyat*) transforms into unity (*wahdaniyyat*). This realm is the beginning of existence in the sense of absolute entity. If we look at this process in the sense of existent, the real creation starts after this realm and all creatures are created in the second entitification, which Ibn Arabi also called as the reality of Muhammad (*haqiqat al-muhammadiyya*). According to Ibn 'Arabi everything is created from this reality.

The descent of the absolute entity to the realm of first entification means He strips down from the stance of trance that eventuates in the level of nonentification, and transforms into a stance that He knows the features in-Himself. Here, features in-Himself means His divine attributes. In this realm, entity knows His attributes and names concisely. However, because attributes are the same thing with His essence, this recognition is nothing more than recognition of His own essence. In this level, there are no separation and multiplicity. The level above the level of first entification is nonentification. The level of first entification is the external side of the level of nonentification and the level of nonentification is the internal side of the level of first entification. That is why; both these levels are front and back faces of one reality. The level of first entification is also called as the realm of divine power (*'alam-i jabarrut*)²⁹¹. Here, the essence of things exists potentially and the process of separation has not started yet. That means, cognizant, recognized, and cognizance²⁹² is one and the same thing.

According to Ibn Arabi, the level of first entification, also called as reality of Muhammad, is a place where all the prophets, saints, scholars took their knowledge

²⁹¹ This realm is where authorities variously locate the human imagination and names of God. Spiritual seekers gain access to the upper realms through the intellectual and imaginative capacities of the heart, and some authors further identify the realm of lordly dominion and/or that of divine power as the realm of imaginative similitudes (*'alam al-mithal*). For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 197. In this realm, substances exist immediately with the order of God. For this, see Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 35.

²⁹² We used these terms as the translations of *'alim*, *ma'lum*, and *'ilm*.

from. From this aspect, the realm is also called as absolute sainthood (*walayat al-muṭlaqa*). There are also external and internal faces of the level of the first entification. The internal face is called absolute saint-hood and external face is called absolute prophet-hood. This realm is actually an isthmus (*barzakh*)²⁹³ between oneness and unity and that is why; it accepts the most holy effusion immediately. The aspect of reality of Muhammad that accepts the most holy effusion is absolute saint-hood. And the aspect of reality of Muhammad that accepts the holy effusion is absolute prophethood. The hadith of “I was a Prophet when Prophet Adam was between water and mud” is significant in this sense. Because, First entification starts before the creation of universe and all created things and the reality of Muhammad is the other name of this entification. As we told above, prophethood of all prophets and sainthood of all saints arise from this realm. Their reality is located in this level. Accordingly; it is also called as the realm of immutabilities (*falak al-thubut*).²⁹⁴

C) The Level of Second Entification (*Ta’ayyun al-Thani*): Attributes that are located collectively in the level of reality of Muhammad separate from each other in the level of second entification. Ibn ‘Arabi again calls this level with many different names. Some of them are as follows, *wahidiyyat*, *hadrat-i rububiyyat*, *‘alam-i ghayb*, *‘alam-i amr*, *‘alam-i malakut*, *‘alam-i baṭin*, *‘alam-i asma*, *‘alam-i thani*, *‘alam-i wujud*, *ahadiyyat-i kathrat*, *tajalli-i thana*, *nafas-i raḥmani* etc. Forms of universal and particular senses that are necessary for names and attributes of Entity separate from each other simply in this level. These forms are the substances of things and none of them have consciousness of their own existence yet, since their existence and separation is still rational not but factual. What disarrays the unity of Entity and makes it separate are these rational forms.

²⁹³ Lexical meaning of the term means an intermediate district between two other districts. This intermediate district is not same with the other two districts but is not completely different from them. It is a place that separates two districts from one another. The term is also passes in the Qur’an. There, the term refers to a realm that is between the world and hereafter, and the place where souls are placed between death and the Judgment Day. (al-Mu’minun/100, ar-Rahman/20.) In the Sufi terminology, the term is generally used to refer the realm of first entification. More precisely, the realm of the first entification is the principal of all isthmuses. For this, see Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 72-73.

²⁹⁴ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 288-94.

Each rational form that entifies in this realm is actually substance of visible things. In the literature of Ibn 'Arabi, each of these rational forms are called as immutable entity (*'ayn-i thabita*), all of them are called as immutable entities. Essential aspect of these immutable entities is absence. They are not restricted with existing in the externality. Everything appeared in the realm of imaginative similitudes (*'alam al-mithal*) are reflections of these immutable entities. Immutable entities that are the essence of possible things acquired constancy, entify as external things in the realm of witnessing (*'alam al-shadat*), after the order of "*kun*"²⁹⁵.²⁹⁶

The process of transformation of immutable entities from potential into actual occurs with the holy effusion. These immutable entities do not exist in the sensible world. However they have effects there. They are the substances of existents. Immutable entities are disclosed in the external world as things. However, they are not existents that separated from the Entity as a possible existent. According to Ibn 'Arabi, whatever you are associated with while you are at the state of immutable entities, it is the thing that appears on your existence. That means, if someone is Muslim during the state of immutable entities, he is a Muslim in this world either. Ibn 'Arabi also makes a distinction between immutable entities and what he called as existent entities (*'ayan-i mawjuda*). God continually manifests Himself in the forms of immutable entities and in the forms of existent entities with His merciful breath. His manifestation in the forms of immutable entities is called the most holy effusion, and in the forms of existent entities is called holy effusion.²⁹⁷

D) The level of Souls (*Martaba al-Arwah*): As other levels, Ibn 'Arabi calls this level with many names either. Some of them are as follows, *ruh-i a'zam*, *miftah-i wujud*, *'alam-i ruh*, *'alam-i amr*, *'alam-i ghayb*, *'alam-i malakut* etc. In this level, immutable entities take one more step through external existence and become an abstract-elementary thing. In this realm, existents have consciousness of themselves, bases,

²⁹⁵ *Kun* is the imperative form of the word of *kavn*. It means "be!". Here, there is reference to verse of Ya-Sin/82 in the noble Qur'an. The complete version of the verse is as follows, "His command is only when He intends a thing that He says to it, 'Be,' and it is."

²⁹⁶ Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 100-102.

²⁹⁷ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 307-09.

and their cognates. They are not matters since they still are not material and the composition that will make them a material has still not occurred. Existents in this realm cannot be seen by eye.²⁹⁸

E) The Level of Imaginative Similitudes (*Martaba al-Mithal*): Ibn 'Arabi calls this level with many names such as '*alam-i malakut*', '*alam-i barzakh*', '*alam-i mithāl*', '*alam-i khayal*', '*mithal-i muqayyad*', '*alam-i khayal-i muttasil*', '*alam-i khayal-i munfasil*' etc. Abstract-elementary things located in the above level make one more step through external existence and transforms into composite substances. This level is called as the level of imaginative similitudes, since a similar form of the substance that will gain matter is located in this realm. This realm is an isthmus between the upper level and below level and that is why; existents in this realm are more solid when compared with the level of souls and softer when compared with the level of witnessing.²⁹⁹

F) The Level of Witnessing (*Martaba al-Shadat*): Ibn 'Arabi also calls this realm as '*suwar-i 'alam*' and '*alam-i ajsam*'. Here, existents above take one more step through external existence and they transform into composite solid substances. This is the realm of visible realms and principals.³⁰⁰

G) The Level of Man (*Martaba al-Insan*): This level is the last one of realms of appearance and gathers the substances of all other levels in itself, except the level of nonentification. This is the last dress that God showed Himself with and there is not a perfect place to appear except human. That is why; this level, together with the above level, is also called as the realm of humanity ('*alam-i nasut*'). Each of these seven realms is the place of appearance of one of the names of God. In the realm of humanity, the greatest name, the name of Allah, appears. Even though this realm is the last one, it is actually higher than other levels, since the name of Allah has a

²⁹⁸ Ibid., 313-14.

²⁹⁹ Ibid., 314.

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 315.

privilege among other names of God. Essences of all realms are located in the essence of humanity. Hence, there is nothing outside of it.³⁰¹

Briefly, according to taxonomy with seven levels, the absolute unity step by step manifests itself and transforms into phenomenal existents. In this process immutable entities play the major role. The level of nonentification is the level that occurs no entity. The level of the first entification is the first step made by the absolute entity. This level is the isthmus between oneness and unity. Entity passes to the state of unity from oneness in this level. The level of second entification is the realm of immutable entities. The attributes also separate from each other in this level. The most holy effusion and the holy effusion also have great significance in the theophany of Entity. The merciful breath of God plays an essential role. In the next level, the level of souls, immutable entities transforms into abstract-elementary things. Subsequent level is the level of imaginative similitudes. Abstract-elementary things transforms into composite substances. This realm is an isthmus and existents in this realm are more solid when compared with the level of souls and softer when compared with the level of witnessing. In the next level, the level of witnessing, composite substances transform into composite solid substances. And the final level, the level of man is the universe we lived in. This is the level of the perfect man. This level is above all other levels except the level of nonentification. The greatest name of God, Allah, manifests itself in this level.

Qunawi's taxonomy with five levels is named as Five Divine Presences (*hazarat al-khams*) in the terminology of Akbari School. Qunawi does not include the level of nonentification above into his taxonomy since it is not a level according to him. Furthermore, he groups remaining six levels under five titles: Divine, Spiritual, Imaginal, Sensory, and level of human that is all-comprehensive. Among these five levels, the level of Divine corresponds to both of first and second entifications. Rest of these levels; Spiritual, Imaginal, Sensory, and level of human respectively correspond to the level of souls, the level of Imaginative Similitudes, the Level of

³⁰¹ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 315.

Witnessing, and the Level of Man in the seven-layered taxonomy. Their aspects are same. The difference is in the taxonomy and bundling of the levels. The pattern and the approach are same.

The taxonomy with four levels is another taxonomy that is used widely. The levels of this taxonomy are the level of pure divinity (*lahut*), the level of divine power (*jabarrut*), the level of lordly dominion (*malakut*), and the level of humanity (*nasut*). In the terminology of Akbari Sufis who use this taxonomy, oneness and the level of nonentification are located in the level of pure divinity. In the level of divine power, the levels of first entification and second entification are located. This is the state of union (*jam*) and is characterized with the most divine name of Allah. In the level of lordly dominion, the levels of souls and imaginative similitudes are located. Finally, in the level of humanity, levels of witnessing and man are located.³⁰²

Ibn 'Arabi mentions of all these taxonomies. He tells the process of theophany, sometimes with respect to one taxonomy and sometimes with respect to another taxonomy. He does not make solid segregations. The framework and the course that followed by entity are same. What is essential for the certainty of belonging of taxonomy to Akbari School is the terminology used. If terms like nonentification, first entification, second entification, and immutable entities are used in the taxonomy, it belongs to a Sufi who is member of Akbari School for sure. About the four-layered taxonomy above, it seems to have a wider user cluster. For example, as we mentioned in Chapter 3, Jilani, Khwafi, and Qudsi used this taxonomy but adopt none of the terms that belong to Akbari School.

4. 2. Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I mainly included the critics of Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun. I suggested that in the centuries after Ibn 'Arabi, refutations directed to his intellectual inheritance are mainly nourished from the perspectives of these three scholars. Headlines of their critics became cliché formulas and are widely used.

³⁰² Ibid., 259.

Common ground in which these prominent scholars met was that they refuted, if I may so, a distorted version of Ibn 'Arabi. They saw for example, Ibn Sab'in, Balyani, Hallaj, Bistami, and Ibn 'Arabi as members of the same cluster of *wujudis*. However, there were great differences between their ideas. For example, for Ibn 'Arabi, Qunawi, and this direct line which reaches to Kayseri, incomparability (*tanzih*) of God was as important as aspect of similarity (*tashbih*). That means, even if this tradition interpreted things in the external world as the theophany of God, they also always reminded that, in the end, God is like nothing and He is exempted from everything else. For Ibn Sab'in and Balyani, as the espousers of the doctrine of the Absolute Unity (*wahda al-mutlaqa*), reality of multiplicity, as the aspect that underscores incomparability of God in Ibn 'Arabi, almost vanishes. However, this difference does not restrain Ibn Taymiyya from claiming that terms of oneness of being, absolute unity, unification (*ittihad*), and incarnation (*hulul*) are synonyms. By doing so, Ibn Taymiyya claims all users of these terms, Ibn Sab'in, Hallaj, Ibn 'Arabi, Christians, *Nusayris*, and philosophers are the members of same cluster of heretics.

In the debates around Ibn 'Arabi, there had been two main veins throughout the history: defenders and detractors. Detractors frequently used the cliché formulas above. In return, defenders of Ibn 'Arabi kept on trying to justify ideas of Ibn 'Arabi by referring books of him and his direct disciples like Qunawi, Farghani, Kashani etc. Eventually, the debate around Ibn 'Arabi started to be done by only quoting from the books of earlier scholars. Critics and apologies started to be made with assertions that almost copy of each other. As if a frozen debate were kept being made and only thing that changes was the names who are participating. They rarely came up with fresh critics. Most of them did not even read Ibn 'Arabi's books and only repeated words of those scholars before them.³⁰³

Here, a question occurs: "Why were they keep doing this debate if both side of it were not even reading the real sources?" Without any doubt, many answers can be given to this question with respect to social, religious, and political dimensions. Knysh

³⁰³ Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi*, 275.

chooses to give an answer that refers to political dimension. According to him, there were two interrelated parts of this answer. First is debate around Ibn 'Arabi came to such an extent that it became an effective machinery for gaining power and supremacy for various religio-politic factions. And the second is, especially after the fifteenth century, the consensus of ulama about the issue of Ibn 'Arabi, in a given geography, was generally determined by the political authority, i.e. Sultan.³⁰⁴ So, in other words, Sufis or ulama were trying to gain supremacy in the eye of Sultan by participating in the debate. Surely, there is a reductive side of this answer and surely there were sincere scholars and Sufis from both sides. At least, there are many scholars who defend Ibn 'Arabi where the political authority was against him and vice versa is true, too. Even so, as we said, this answer corresponds to political dimension of the debate and provides a good basis for emergence of the aforementioned cliché formulas.

In brief, throughout the history, Ibn 'Arabi became such a figure that scholars, Sufis and sultans discussed furiously. Between these furious debates, complex and intricate ideas of Ibn 'Arabi have been rebuilt but this time complex character of them vanished. Ibn 'Arabi has been reconstructed as a polemical figure and polemicists from both sides used his ideas as a weapon. Aspects of this image that is nourished by anecdotes, rumors, and stories are utilized by both sides to dramatize him as a perfect Sufi or a heretic.³⁰⁵ Like any great doctrine that becomes public property, Ibn 'Arabi's teaching is reconstructed as a set of thematic axes that remained unchanged in different historical and theological contexts.³⁰⁶ His ideas reduced to a set of clichéd formulas just about for a scholar or Sufi to manifest his position via Ibn 'Arabi.

The doctrine of oneness of being and levels of existence were leading these formulas. Also, Ibn 'Arabi's claims on Pharaoh's faith, seal of sainthood, comparison of sainthood with prophethood, and state of infidels in hell were included.

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 274.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 275.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 5.

On the issue of oneness of being, Ibn Taymiyya asserts that the term of oneness of being is synonym with absolute entity (*wahda al-miutlaqa*), unification and incarnation. He directly ascribes this doctrine to Ibn 'Arabi and Qunawi says that roots of this doctrine is found in Christianity and Mu'tazila. Furthermore, according to Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn 'Arabi is influenced from extremist statements of "*ana al-haqq*" and "*subhani...*" of Hallaj and Bistami in his doctrine of oneness of being. Ibn Taymiyya denominates Ibn 'Arabi as a lured Sufi (*maftun*) and says that with his doctrine of oneness of being, Ibn 'Arabi polluted the authentic Sufism with philosophy.

Taftazani uses the term of *wujudi* when he is mentioning Ibn 'Arabi and his followers and sees the term of absolute entity as synonyms of oneness of being. According to Taftazani, this sect of *wujudis* sees everything, including the most disgusting things, identical with God. Taftazani, also as Ibn Taymiyya, believes that Ibn 'Arabi and his followers polluted true Sufism with philosophy.

Taftazani's teacher Iji, is among the scholars who blame Ibn 'Arabi and his followers with unification and incarnation. According to him, espousers of these two heretic doctrines are Christians, *Nusayris*, and extremist Sufis like Ibn 'Arabi and his followers. However, Iji distinguishes the group that he called monist Sufis. According to him, they are on the true path however as a similar group to them, *wujudis* are on the false path. These *wujudis* are Ibn 'Arabi and his followers.

Ibn Khaldun, either, blames Ibn 'Arabi and his followers with unification and incarnation and asserts that they polluted authentic Sufism with philosophy. According to him, Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of oneness of being and levels of existence find their roots in the Greek philosophy.

If we compare ideas of Ibn Taymiyya, Iji, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun with ideas of Khwafi and Qudsi we see great similarities. Both of them do not give names of Ibn 'Arabi or his followers directly as these four prominent scholars. However, both of them harshly criticize a sect that they called *wujudiyyan*. This sect is among the heretic sects according to both of Qudsi and Khwafi. Khwafi says that *Wujudis* find their roots in philosophers and Qudsi says that assertions of *wujudis*, which is

conceptualized with the term of absolute unity (*wahda al-mutlaqa*), find their roots in unification and incarnation. Qudsi says that we reject their ideas as we rejected Christians. Furthermore, Qudsi denominates the sect of *wujudi* as a lured sect (*maftunin*) which is the exact same term Ibn Taymiyya used for Ibn 'Arabi. Another great resemblance between Qudsi and Ibn Taymiyya is that both of them claim that "*ana al-haqq*" and "*subhani..*" of Hallaj and Bistami influenced heretics in this lured sect. Qudsi and Khwafi also show another great resemblance with Iji when both of them are distinguishing a group of Sufis from the sect of *wujudiyyan*. According to them, these Sufis, even if their assertions remind of the assertions of *wujudiyyan*, they are not heretics. They are Sufis on the true path. This is the exact same thing claimed by Iji.

In the issue of oneness of being, Qudsi and Khwafi never mention name of Ibn 'Arabi or his direct disciples on the contrary of Ibn Taymiyya, Iji, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun. Furthermore, Khwafi directly asserts that Ibn 'Arabi is among the Sufis on true path. However, Khwafi and Qudsi's critics of the sect of *wujudiyyan* are influenced directly from critics of these four prominent scholars. They use same terminology, same context, and same argumentation; even their examples are same. Furthermore, both Khwafi and Qudsi criticized Ibn 'Arabi's assertion of Pharaoh's faith as Taftazani and Ibn Taymiyya did. And Khwafi criticized Ibn 'Arabi's seal of sainthood. This doctrine is also criticized by Ibn 'Abd al-Salam, Ibn Taymiyya, and Ibn Khaldun. However, in this issue, Khwafi adopts the approach of Tirmidhi by saying that the real seal of sainthood is Mahdi who will come just before the Judgment Day. These three names also criticize Tirmidhi's approach, too.

As for the doctrine of levels of existence, both Khwafi and Qudsi adopt the taxonomy with four levels. As we mentioned above, this taxonomy is used by Akbari Sufis, either. However, usage of this taxonomy is dated before Ibn 'Arabi. As an example, we gave the assertion of Jilani. Furthermore, as far as I could ascertain, there are two requirements that make a taxonomy of levels of existence belong to Akbari School. First is terminologies peculiar to Akbari School must be used, such as nonentification, immutable entities, first and second entifications etc. And the second is the process

should be explained from top to bottom since according to followers of Ibn 'Arabi this is the process of theophany and entification of the Entity, i. e. the creation of cosmos. Qudsi and Khwafi's assertion of cosmological realms do not accord with these two requirements. They never use Akbari terminology and explain this process from down to top since according to them these realms are actually stations that seeker will pass through during his spiritual journey.

In the light of these evidences, we can conveniently say that Khwafi and Qudsi were among the group of detractors of Ibn 'Arabi. They used the same cliché formulas that are built by aforementioned prominent scholars and frequently used by the later detractors. However, both of them avoided from directly blaming Ibn 'Arabi with heresy.

CHAPTER 5

ZAYNIYYA IN ANATOLIA: AKBARI ZAYNIS

In this chapter, I will mention five names, Şehabeddin Sivasi, Molla Fenari, Kutbüddinzade İzniki, Piri Halife Hamidi, and Sheikh Vefa. These names will be examined with respect to their affiliation with Ibn ‘Arabi and his intellectual inheritance. The reason of my election of these names is that I suggest they were Akbari Sufis on the contrary of their sheikhs in Zayniyya, ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi, and Zayn al-Din Khwafi. Only exception in this sense is Şehabeddin Sivasi. He includes Ibn ‘Arabi when he is writing his chain of order. Academic literature about him indicates that he sees Ibn ‘Arabi as a spiritual sheikh for himself. I included him for showing that inclusion of Ibn ‘Arabi to his chain was just an error. Other figures on the other hand, show a clear intimacy with Ibn ‘Arabi. There is no doubt about Molla Fenari’s adoption of Ibn ‘Arabi’s ideas. So, I included him to debate about his affiliation with Zayniyya. İzniki is an outstanding figure. Like his teacher Molla Fenari, his affiliation with Ibn ‘Arabi is clear. However, he shows an exception by showing a contrary stance on the issues of Pharaoh’s faith and state of infidels in hell. In these issues, he speaks as if he does not agree with Ibn ‘Arabi. Piri Halife is important as a Zayni sheikh who speaks of the comparison of sainthood with prophethood. However, he does not speak of the issue of seal of sainthood. Major name in this chapter is Sheikh Vefa. He is one of two most important disciples of Qudsi. Other one is Taceddin İbrahim. Qudsi places a great importance on Sheikh Vefa and shows him great respect. As we mentioned in the Chapter 3, Qudsi mentions Sheikh Vefa in *Kashf al-I’tiqad*. Furthermore, Sheikh Vefa is scribal of Qudsi’s four books. However, Sheikh Vefa clearly shows that he thinks different in certain issues. Sheikh Vefa keeps some of norms of Zayniyya tariqa as they are built by Khwafi and Qudsi but also he clearly adopts doctrine of oneness of being and levels of existence of Akbari School. His *Saz-i ‘Irfan* shows consonance with the doctrine of Five Divine Presences of Qunawi. Consequently, Sheikh Vefa comes forward as a Zayni sheikh who interpreted the tariqa with an Akbari color. Number of Zayni disciples in Anatolia is not limited with five of course. I included only ones who affiliated with Ibn ‘Arabi. However, none of

the other Zayni sheikhs in Anatolia shows an anti-Ibn 'Arabi stance. The reason of my exclusion their names from this work is that they do not speak of any of the issues explained in Chapter 4. It should be noted that this silence is significant since it shows refutation of Ibn 'Arabi by Khwafi and Qudsi did not continue in none of the Zayni derviches in Anatolia.

Before the evaluation of these five sheikhs who adopt an Akbari stance, I will give a brief picture of Ibn 'Arabi's reception in the Ottoman State. This picture is important for understanding one of the major components in which Ottoman scholars and Sufis have been brought up.

5. 1. Early Ottoman Reception of Ibn 'Arabi

Since this section will be a brief examination of Ibn 'Arabi's influence on the Ottoman intellectual life, it is useful to assert our argument in the beginning: Ottomans inherited intellectual legacy of Ibn 'Arabi as a major component of their intellectual and religious institutions. Prominent scholars and Sufis in the early Ottoman period are not just the followers of Akbari School, but also producers and formulators of their doctrines. Beside many other aspects, Ottomans derived Ibn 'Arabi's intellectual inheritance from Anatolian Saljuks.³⁰⁷ First prominent scholar/bureaucrats of Ottomans like Davud Kayseri and Molla Fenari stemmed from the direct chain that link them to Ibn 'Arabi. Beside these scholars, intellectual products of the first generation of Qunawi's disciples are interpreted and used greatly by Ottoman Sufis and scholars. Consequently, Ibn 'Arabi became one of the most prominent figure in configuration of Ottoman intellectual horizon.

Through Ibn 'Arabi's textual and interpretative community³⁰⁸ the greatest influence of Ibn 'Arabi was to Anatolia.³⁰⁹ This textual community emerged in Konya under the leadership of Ibn 'Arabi's stepson Qunawi. After that doctrines of Akbari School

³⁰⁷ Ahmed Zildzic, "Friend and Foe: The Early Ottoman reception of Ibn 'Arabi" (PhD diss., University of California, 2012), 81-82.

³⁰⁸ A term used by Zildzic in his dissertation to refer Qunawi and his direct pupils. Zildzic, "Friend and Foe," v.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., 52-53.

influenced Anatolia for centuries.³¹⁰ Jami, in his *Nafahat*, asserts Qunawi's central role in Ibn 'Arabi's inheritance as asserting that Qunawi explained and interpreted Ibn 'Arabi's oneness of being as correspondingly to reason and sharia. According to Jami, it is impossible to comprehend Ibn 'Arabi's ideas without reading Qunawi's works about the subject.³¹¹ Qunawi is the one who systematized Ibn 'Arabi's complex and dispersed ideas. He wrote many books and trained many scholars and thus played the main role in systematization and diffusion of Ibn 'Arabi's doctrines in Anatolia, Persia, and many more lands.

Ibn 'Arabi authorized Qunawi for teaching all of his books.³¹² However, in the issue of Ibn 'Arabi, Qunawi made courses on three books, *Fusus* and *Futuhāt* of Ibn 'Arabi and Ibn al-Farid's (d. 1235) *Nazm al-Suluk* (The Poem of the Way) also known as *al-Ta'īyya*. Ibn al-Farid was a Sufi and probably the greatest Arabic poet of the age and was also Qunawi's contemporary. Qunawi used to show him great respect. Qunawi started his courses on *al-Ta'īyya* in Egypt and continued in Syria and Anatolia. In these courses, first he used to speak about different sciences and then finish the course with interpretation of one verse from *al-Ta'īyya*. Two different approaches within Sufism were being reflected in these courses, the ecstatic poetical type represented by Hallaj, Bistami, and Ibn Farid, and the speculative, methodological type represented by Ghazzali, Junayd, and of course Ibn 'Arabi.³¹³

Farghani was among prominent figures in the textual and interpretative community of Ibn 'Arabi and was one of Qunawi's most outstanding figure. His effort in systematization of Ibn 'Arabi's ideas is as important as Qunawi. He wrote a famous commentary in Persian, on *al-Ta'īyya* with the name of *Mashariq al-Darari*, from the

³¹⁰ Qunawi's status as stepson of Ibn 'Arabi is a contradictive subject. However, since two prominent scholar on Ibn 'Arabi tentatively accepted it we chose to accept it, either. William C. Chittick, "The Central Point Qunawi's Role in the School of Ibn 'Arabi," *Journal of Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 35 (2004): 25; Michel Chodkiewicz, "İbn Arabî'nin Öğretisinin Osmanlı Dünyasında Karşılığı," in *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler Kaynaklar-Doktrin-Ayin ve Erkan-Tarikatlar-Edebiyat-Mimari-İkonografi-Modernizm*, ed. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2014), 97.

³¹¹ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 632.

³¹² Chittick, "The Central Point," 25.

³¹³ Jane Clark, "Early Best-sellers in the Akbarian Tradition: The Dissemination of Ibn 'Arabi's Teaching Through Sadr al-Din Qunawi," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* XXXIII (2003): 18-20, accessed May 25, 2017, <http://www.ibnarabisociety.org/articlespdf/bestsellers.pdf>.

notes he took during Qunawi's courses. Qunawi wrote an introduction to it. Then, he translated it into Arabic for reaching a wider audience. Thanks to efforts of Qunawi and Farghani, Ibn Farid's *al-Ta'iyya* became an inseparable part of Akbari School.³¹⁴

Jandi is another prominent figure in diffusion of Ibn 'Arabi's ideas in Ottomans. Like Farghani, he was student of Qunawi. Information on his life is scarce. Main importance of Jandi comes from his commentaries on two books of Ibn 'Arabi. After a divine inspiration he experienced, Jandi decides to write a commentary to Ibn 'Arabi's *Fusus* and this is the first commentary written for this book. In this sense, this commentary constitutes a model and main source for the later commentaries. Jandi is also the first commentator of another book of Ibn 'Arabi, this time a less famous one, *Mawaqi al-Nujum*. The only known commentary writer for *Mawaqi al-Nujum* is an Ottoman Sufi, Selahaddin el-Uşşaki el-Bosnevi (1782). We do not have Jandi's commentary, but probably Bosnevi influenced from him greatly since Jandi is the first and only commentator of the book.

The main influence of Jandi to Ottoman context is with his commentary on *Fusus* as we mentioned. This commentary is widely used by Ottomans. There are many copies of the book in Turkish libraries. Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed (d. 1451) who is the disciple of famous Sufi Hacı Bayram Veli (d. 1430) wrote a super-gloss (*hashiya*) to Jandi's commentary of *Fusus*. Mehmed's brother Bican Yazıcıoğlu translated his brother's work into Turkish with the name of *Kitab al-Muntaha 'ala al-Fusus*.³¹⁵ Beside Qunawi, Jandi was the other teacher of Qashani in study of *Fusus*.³¹⁶

Qashani is key figure in dissemination of doctrines of Ibn 'Arabi in Ottoman world because of his prominent student Davud Kayseri (d. 1350) who is the first head teacher (*başmüderri*) of first Ottoman madrasa, Orhaniye. In this sense, Qashani was the link between first generation and second generation of Akbari School. He carried ideas of Akbari School from direct disciples of Qunawi like Farghani and Jandi to

³¹⁴ Clark, "Early Best-sellers," 20; Zildzic, "Friend and Foe," 68.

³¹⁵ Ekrem Demirli, *Tasavvufun Altın Çağı*, 38; Zildzic, "Friend and Foe," 67-68.

³¹⁶ Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences," 107.

Ottoman scholars who did not personally met with Qunawi but contributed to Ibn 'Arabi's intellectual legacy with new commentaries and books. Qashani wrote a commentary on *Fusus* and this work became one of the pioneer works in the field. Like Jandi's commentary, Qashani's commentary also became a model for later commentaries on *Fusus*. His other important book is his glossary of terminology of Sufism, *Istilahat al-Sufiyya*. In the introduction of this book, Qashani asserts that he writes the book for making understanding of three books easier, *Fusus* of Ibn 'Arabi, *Manazil al-Sa'irin* of Khwaja 'Abdullah Ansari, and his own exegesis of Qur'an, *Ta'wilat al-Qur'an*.³¹⁷

Ibn 'Arabi served for the rulers as advisor in Anatolia, Aleppo, and Damascus. His letter to Saljuk Sultan Kayhusraw I in which he criticized Sultan's soft attitudes toward Christians is famous in this sense. Just like their greatest master Ibn 'Arabi, members of his textual and interpretative community in Ottomans advised rulers as well. Two of these members are significant, Davud Kayseri and Molla Fenari. In the early period of Ottomans, it is possible to find many Akbari figures in the top levels of bureaucracy. Kayseri as the direct member of Akbari School served as the head teacher of the first Ottoman madrasa, Orhaniye Medresesi, and his student Molla Fenari was assigned for the three posts in Bursa, head theacher of Manastır Medresesi, qadi of Bursa, and mufti of the Ottoman state.³¹⁸ Because of these assignments, many modern scholars accepted Molla Fenari as the first sheikh al-Islam of Ottoman state.

After finishing his education in Islamic sciences, Kayseri entered service of Qashani. Qashani was Kayseri's teacher in Akbari School.³¹⁹

Kayseri wrote a commentary on the *Fusus* with the name of *Matla' Khusus al-Kilam fi Ma'ani Fusus al-Hikam*. Like previous commentaries, this one also became a model for the later commentaries. Introduction of this *Fusus* is frequently used as a separate book as an interpretative work of Ibn 'Arabi's complex doctrines. His commentary

³¹⁷ Zildzic, "Friend and Foe," 69-71.

³¹⁸ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 25.

³¹⁹ Zildzic, "Friend and Foe," 72.

and introduction is accepted as the best by both traditional and modern scholars. This aspect of his commentary was arising from Kayseri's ability to simplify complex and difficult statements of Ibn 'Arabi. Beside his famous commentary on *Fusus*, Kayseri also wrote commentaries on Ibn Farid's two poems, *Qasida al-Ta'iyya* and *Qasida al-Mimiyya*. Kayseri's commentaries on *Fusus* and Ibn Farid's poems had great influence on later Ottoman scholars and Sufis. Many Ottoman scholars wrote their books as interpretations of Kayseri's commentaries or by taking inspiration from him.³²⁰ Among these names, we can count Molla Fenari, Kutbüddin İzniki, Sheikh Bedreddin, and Sheikh Vefa, as we will see in the subsequent pages.

Molla Fenari represents the following generation of Akbari School. As we mentioned above, Bayezid I assigned him to three prominent posts in Bursa. Beside many others, the most famous work of Molla Fenari is the commentary he wrote on *Miftah al-Ghayb* of Qunawi, *Misbah al-Uns*.³²¹ Another prominent figure in dissemination of Ibn 'Arabi's ideas in Ottoman State was Kutbüddin İzniki who is another figure linked with Orhaniye medresesi as the student of Molla Fenari. He wrote a commentary on *Miftah al-Ghayb* of Konevi, like his teacher, with the name of *Fath Miftah al-Ghayb*. In this commentary, he frequently gave references to his teacher's work, *Misbah al-Uns*.³²²

We do not know what was the curriculum of the first two madrasas of Ottoman State, Orhaniye and Manastır, if there were books of Ibn 'Arabi or Ibn Farid. However, it won't be wrong to assume that, intellectual inclinations of head teachers of these two madrasas, Kayseri and Molla Fenari, had a great influence in the education. Both scholars had a high status in the eyes of Sultans of the age, Orhan Gazi and Bayezid I and they were educating future high positioned bureaucrats as trustworthy scholars.³²³ Because of their influence on the administration, Sultans had intimacy with Ibn 'Arabi and his school, too.

³²⁰ Ibid., 73-74; Clark, "Early Best-sellers," 20.

³²¹ Clark, "Early Best-sellers," 14.

³²² Zildzic, "Friend and Foe," 80-81.

³²³ Ibid., 77-78.

Kılıç asserts that, Şeyh Edebali (d. 1326), the advisor of Osman Gazi, most probably attended courses of Ibn ‘Arabi in Damascus.³²⁴ Another sultan who took an Akbari figure as advisor was Mehmet II. Disciple of Hacı Bayram Veli, Akşemseddin (d. 1459) was a follower of Ibn ‘Arabi and served as a prominent advisor of Mehmet II. Mehmet II also commissioned three commentaries on Qunawi’s books including İzniki’s *Fath Miftah al-Ghayb*. He also ordered translation of Qunawi’s books into Persian and included Jandi’s commentary on *Fusus* to his library.³²⁵

It is possible to find intimacy with Ibn ‘Arabi and his school in each of early Ottoman sultans. They always protected and exalted Sufis and scholars who are members of Akbari School. It is interesting that, there are no fatwas written about Ibn ‘Arabi until the Egypt and Damascus campaigns of Selim I. That means, until the entrance of scholars who are educated in these lands to Ottoman lands, the problematic clichés mentioned in the previous chapter was not seen as a problem in the eyes of sultans or the religious elite. Of course, this does not mean that, scholars and Sufis were not aware of these problematic issues around Ibn ‘Arabi as we will see in the oncoming pages. This was an age that scholars were frequently traveling around educational centers of the age. Hence, books and debates were being transmitted rapidly. In remainder sections of these chapters, we will see that how Zayni disciples with Akbari inclination participated in the debate about Ibn ‘Arabi.

5. 2. Şehabeddin Sivasi (d. 1455)

In this section, I will mention Sivasi by focusing on his affiliation with Akbari School. My suggestion is that he was affiliated with Akbari School no more than ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi. The reason of my inclusion of Sivasi in this text is that in the literature on Zayniyya and Sivasi reflects such an affiliation because of chain of order he gave in his *Jazzab al-Qulub*. I suggest that this chain is full of discrepancies with other Zayni chains and inclusion of Ibn ‘Arabi is just another mistake he did. Sivasi’s perspective in his books of Sufism confirms this suggestion. In this section, I examined his two

³²⁴ Kılıç, *Şeyh-i Ekber*, 78-79.

³²⁵ Clark, “Early Best-sellers,” 13-14.

books on Sufism, respectively *Risala al-Najat min Sharr al-Sifat* and *Jazzab al-Qulub ila Tariq al-Mahbub*.

Sivasi's real name is Ahmed b. Muhammad and was a slave in Sivas. There is no information about date of his birth and place.³²⁶ He learned basic Islamic sciences at a very young age. Afterwards, he specialized in these sciences by learning them from the prominent scholars of the age. After his education in Islamic sciences, he met with Sheikh Muhammed and affiliated with Sufism. He went to Ayaslug³²⁷ with his sheikh and settled there. Taşköprizade gives his date of death as 1475. However, Dartma states his date of death as 8 February 1455. According to him, sources give four dates for Sivasi's death and these are 1378, 1400, 1455, and 1475. The most important evidence for Dartma's determination is the date written on Sivasi's gravestone.³²⁸

Sivasi's sheikh Sheikh Muhammad was initiated to the tariqa from Zayn al-Din Khwafi. In the biographical sources of the age, the emphasis of authors is generally on Sivasi. Reason of this focus is Sivasi's famous exegesis of Qur'an '*Uyun al-Tafasir*. He is known as the first exegete who made a complete exegesis of Qur'an for the Ottoman period. His Qur'anic exegesis is very famous and written in the form of *dirayat*³²⁹. There are more than 100 copies of this exegesis in the libraries of Istanbul.³³⁰ Beside his exegesis of Qur'an, Sivasi has five more books in the libraries. Sivasi wrote about both Islamic sciences and Sufism. He has a book on hadith, a book on fiqh, a book on Arabic grammar, and his exegesis of Qur'an. Besides these, he has two books on Sufism, *Risala al-Najat* and *Jazzab al-Qulub*.

³²⁶ Bahattin Dartma, "Beylikler Devrinin Mümtaz ve Mütevazi Bir Şahsiyeti: Şihabuddin es-Sivasi," in *Selçuklular Döneminde Sivas, Sempozyum Bildirileri 29 Eylül-1 Ekim 2005*, ed. İbrahim Yasak (Sivas: Sivas Valiliği, 2006), 225.

³²⁷ Selçuk/Izmir today.

³²⁸ Ibid., 226-27.

³²⁹ Ibid., 229. In the form of *dirayat* exegesis, exegete does not count on the only reports about a verse, he also examines these reports from rational aspects. For further information see, article of "Tefsir" in DiA.

³³⁰ Dartma, "Şihabuddin es-Sivasi," 226.

Risala al-Najat is a glossary of terminology of Sufism. Sivasi explains the terms and these terms are attitudes that should be followed by Sufis who wish to clean themselves from the bad epithets.³³¹ Sivasi counts ten terms. These terms are, respectively, reclusion, silence except invocation (*dhikr*), fasting, invocation, surrendering and resigning to Allah, detracting the bad ideas from the mind, establishing a profound spiritual connection with the Sheikh (*rabita*), abandoning the sleep except the needed amount, and eating sparingly from the halal food.³³²

As an interesting part in *Risala al-Najat*, is that the only name referred throughout the book is Junayd Baghdadi. Sivasi says, "This is the word of Junayd and he is the leader of this tariqa."³³³ After this part, comes the chapter about the importance of showing respect to the sheikh. He says, it is not permitted to wear clothes of sheikh, and again it is not permitted to sit in his room. Besides, if the sheikh dies or divorces, it is not permitted for disciples to marry with the wife of his sheikh since she is like a mother to them. It is also not permitted to object to the sheikh while he is talking and it is forbidden to laugh beside him.³³⁴ These are widely known manners for the relation of the disciple with his sheikh. In that sense, Sivasi reflects the same perspective with the hundreds of books of Sufism written on the subject.

Subsequent chapter is about the asceticism and the principles of seclusion. According to Sivasi, asceticism does not excel without the seclusion or companionship/conversation with the friend (or owner) of seclusion (*suhba sahib al-khalwa*). And he says conversation is much better than the seclusion. Because the influence of conversation is stronger than the influence of seclusion.³³⁵ This is an interesting stance for a Zayni disciple. Sufis of the earlier ages give great importance to conversation. Sheikhs used to teach important spiritual secrets to disciples during private conversations. The antonym of conversation is seclusion. Some tariqas give priority to conversation and some to the seclusion. For example, for the orders of

³³¹ Şehabeddin Sivasi, *Risala al-Najat min Sharr al-Sifat*, (SK, HALET Efendi, no. 246), 61b.

³³² Ibid., 61b-67a.

³³³ Ibid., 70b.

³³⁴ Ibid., 71a.

³³⁵ Ibid., 71b.

Naqshbandiyya and Mawlawiyya, conversation is more important.³³⁶ On the contrary, Zayn al-Din Khwafi gives priority to the seclusion. According to Khwafi, the best way of protection from the depravity of people is seclusion. The reason of bad epithets, such as gossip, lie, hypocrisy, arrogance etc., is mingling with people. The best way of disposing of these bad epithets is seclusion.³³⁷

Following chapter is about the results of deeds that are appropriate in sharia and miracles of the organs that are obligated to sharia. In this chapter, Sivasi informs the reader about the basic information of Islamic catechism. He explains the basic terms of fiqh, such as *wajib*, *mandub*, *mubah* etc. If the disciple knows these terms, he can correct his view and fulfill the Islamic requirements. According to Sivasi, there are eight organs that are obliged to sharia. These are eye, ear, tongue, hand, stomach, sexual organs of men and women, and heart. Sivasi explains the Islamic obligations for all of these organs and says knowing and practicing these obligations reaches the Muslim to the happiness.³³⁸ In the last part of this chapter, he explains the miracles of each organ. For example, the miracle of ear is hearing the speech of inorganic entities.³³⁹ Sivasi ends his book with this chapter. Sivasi's explanations of miracles of organs resembles the approach in Ibn 'Arabi's *Mawaqi al-Nujum*. However, there is no direct reference or record that makes us think that Sivasi is influenced from Ibn 'Arabi in this manner.

Risala al-Najat is an inclusive book that addresses to the all orders of Sufism. There is no indication of Sivasi's affiliation with Zayniyya tariqa or Akbari School. He frequently uses the term of "this order" throughout the book but, from the context of these uses, we understand that he refers to the Sufism in general, every time. He shows Junayd Baghdadi as the leader of "this order". Junayd Baghdadi is a famous and great sheikh who lived in the early period of Islamic history and honored by each Sufi tariqa without any exceptions. What is interesting about the book is the chapter about the seclusion. Sivasi, as a Zayni disciple, clearly express the priority of

³³⁶ Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 321.

³³⁷ Köle, *Zeynüddin*, 209.

³³⁸ Sivasi, *Risala al-Najat*, 73a.

³³⁹ Ibid., 75a.

conversation/companion over seclusion. This expression contradicts with Khwafi's view on the subject.

Jazzab al-Qulub is Sivasi's second book on Sufism. This book is also a glossary of Sufi terminology. Sivasi firstly defines a concept and after that he gives characteristics of it. If there are any sub-categories of the concept, he gives and defines them, too. Sivasi usually gives verses of Qur'an and hadith as evidence for his words. He also quotes from companies of Prophet Muhammad, also from statements of famous ulama and Sufis. In many places, he refers to ulama and Sufis, as groups supporting his own ideas, but does not define the content of the term. Throughout the book, two names from this ulema and Sufi groups are mentioned explicitly. These names are Abu Bakr al-Shibli (d. 946) and Yahya b. Mu'az (d. 872). Both names are great sheikhs of the earlier period of history of Sufism. The subjects Sivasi refers them are the subjects these two names specialized on. For example, the first place Shibli's name is appeared is the chapter of gnostic knowledge (*ma'rifa*).³⁴⁰ Shibli is the disciple (maybe the most famous one) of Junayd Baghdadi and he is a close friend of Hallaj Mansur. Beside his Sufi orientation he is also known with his reputation in Islamic sciences. Shibli mentions many concepts related to Sufism. However the primary subjects he defined are gnostic knowledge and divine unity (*ma'rifa wa tawhid*).

In his *Jazzab*, Sivasi explains the concepts like, science, faith, Islam, spiritual virtue, invocation, spiritual steadfastness, piety etc. These are widely used terms. Accordingly, Sivasi, in his book, targets a general audience but not the disciples of a specific Sufi order. In *Jazzab*, there are two issues related with Ibn 'Arabi. First is the chapter of saints and prophets, and the second is the chapter of external and internal meanings of wearing the cloak (*khirqā*)³⁴¹.

³⁴⁰ Şehabeddin Sivasi, *Jazzab al-Qulub ila Tariq al-Mahbub*, (SK, Hacı Mahmut Efendi, no. 3255), 4a.

³⁴¹ Also called the "patched frock," the *khirqā* ("rag") or *muraqqa'a* ("assembled from pieces") is an article of clothing symbolic of initiation into Sufi life through the oath of obedience to the sheikh. Though most Sufis have typically been invested with the cloak as part of formal ceremonies in institutional settings, some have claimed that they received the garment directly from Khidr or some other "spirit-sheikh" in dreams or visions. Some distinguish between spiritual and material cloaks. In any case, the garment represents authoritative incorporation into a Sufi lineage, and sources as early

In the chapter of saints and prophet, Sivasi starts the chapter with references to the verses and hadiths. These are widely known arguments used by Sufis who talks about the issue. Then, he defines the sainthood as the credo that exists together with the piety.³⁴² In the last part of this chapter, Sivasi quotes from theologians (*ahl-i kalam*), and says, according to them, wonders (*karamat*) belong to the saints and evidentiary miracles (*mu'jizat*)³⁴³ belong to prophets. Then, Sivasi compares these two kinds of miracles. *Mu'jizat* occurs after the invocation and prophets know the miracle that is going to occur. On the contrary, *karamat* does not occur because of the invocation and saints do not know the miracle before it occurs.³⁴⁴

In this passage, Sivasi choose not to enter to the debate of comparison of sainthood with prophethood. Maybe he was not even aware of this debate. The only thing he does is to define the difference between prophets and saints and he does that only in the context of issue of miracle.

The second chapter related with Ibn 'Arabi is the chapter of external and internal meanings of wearing the cloak. In the beginning, Sivasi makes taxonomy with respect to two categories, external meaning of wearing the cloak and the internal meaning. Additionally, he divides both of these titles into two subcategories, essential clothes and nonessential clothes.

as the third/eighth century spoke of donning the cloak as an indicator that an individual traveled a distinctive spiritual path. Eventually various orders may have used different kinds of cloaks to distinguish different ranks within the organization. Many Sufis trace the origins of the symbolic conferral of a cloak to the experience of the Prophet himself, upon whom God, and later Gabriel, bestowed the cloak of poverty. The concept of the hereditary symbolism associated with the cloak applies also to other implements and items of clothing. Some orders also considered the cloak as a reminder of the burial cloth, symbolic of the individual's awareness of mortality and death to self. Abbasid caliphs and rulers in Egypt and Syria after them also conferred a special cloak as symbol of membership in chivalric organizations. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 63.

³⁴² Sivasi, *Jazzab*, 6a.

³⁴³ For *karamat* and *mu'jizat*: Extraordinary deeds performed by Friends of God with the intervention of divine power. These marvels, known as *karamat*, run a wide gamut from fairly simple, homey acts, such as finding small-lost treasures of value only to the owner, to altering the course of natural events. Islamic tradition early on developed a distinction between the "evidentiary miracles" vouchsafed only to prophets (*mu'jiza/-at*) and deeds apparently wondrous of which an array of other persons seemed to be capable. For hardcore theological purposes, such deeds performed by the enemies of prophets were categorized as sleight of hand, magic (*sihr*), while the term "marvel" or "wonder" was reserved for amazing acts attributed to saintly persons. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 256.

³⁴⁴ Sivasi, *Jazzab*, 6a.

According to Sivasi, essential external clothes are only for covering up the genitals. Nonessential external clothes are the ornaments. In this part, Sivasi advises to wear modest dresses and says wearing black and wool is the sunna of Prophet Muhammad.

Then he explains the essential internal cloths and the nonessential. According to Sivasi, essential internal cloth is the piety and the nonessential cloth is the social ethics and best of manners (*makarim al-akhlaq*). The term of *makarim al-akhlaq* is also the name of one of Ibn Arabi's books.³⁴⁵ Sivasi, in this part, intends sharia and Sufism with the analogy of essential and nonessential internal cloth.

After these explanatory parts, Sivasi directly mentions Ibn 'Arabi. He says, "When friends of God wanted to bring the two kinds of internal clothes together, they wear the cloak and the meaning of this cloak is well known for them. This cloak is worn with piety." The meaning of this cloak is the initiation. In that sense, uniting the two kinds of internal clothes becomes possible only through initiation. Then, Sivasi states his own chain of initiation. According to Sivasi his chain is as follows, Şehabeddin Sivasi > Sheikh Zayn al-Din al-Misri > Sheikh 'Abd al-Nur > Sheikh Muhyi al-Din al-'Arabi > Sheikh Yunus Jamal al-Din al-'Abbasi > 'Abd al-Qadir (Jilani) > Abi Sa'id (al-Mubarak b. 'Ali Muharrimi) > 'Ali b. Muhammad al-Fadl 'Abd al-Wahid (b. 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Tamimi) > Abi Bakr Muhammad b. Khalaf al-Shibli > Abi al-Qasim al-Sheikh Junayd (Baghdadi) > Sari al-Saqati > 'Ali b. Musa > Ma'ruf al-Karkhi > 'Ali b. Musa > his father Musa b. Ja'far > his father Ja'far b. Muhammad > his father Muhammad b. 'Ali > his father al-Husayn b. 'Ali b. Abi Talib > Prophet Muhammad > Angel Gabriel > Allah.³⁴⁶

This is an interesting chain since it is incompatible with any of the known chains of Zayniyya. Contemporary scholars who study on the subject agree with the claim that the chain in *Jazzab* is actually an internal and spiritual chain since Sivasi in the related

³⁴⁵ Muhyiddin İbn Arabi, *Mekarimu'l-Ahlak Üstün Ahlak* (İstanbul: Kitsan Basım Yayın, 2005).

³⁴⁶ Sivasi, *Jazzab*, 7a-7b.

passage explains the internal clothing.³⁴⁷ This assertion looks accurate at first glance however, the reason of this discrepancy maybe just an error made by Sivasi.

There are two chains of order for the order of Qadiriyya. These two chains are identical from 'Abd al-Qadir Jilani to the great sheikh Ma'ruf al-Karkhi. After him, chain proceeds from two separate channels. First one proceeds as Sheikh Davud al-Ta'i > Sheikh Habib al-'Ajami > Sheikh Hasan al-Basri > fourth khalifa 'Ali b. Abu Talib. The second chain of *Qadiriyya* reaches to Imam 'Ali b. Musa after Ma'ruf al-Karkhi and follows the path Sivasi gave in his *Jazzab*. This chain is called the *silsila al-dhahab*.³⁴⁸

As for Ibn 'Arabi, usually three chains are attributed to him. First one reaches directly to the Khidr via Sheikh Taqiyy al-Din Jami. The second is the Madyaniyya tariqa via Sheikh Abu Madyan, and the third reaches to Sheikh 'Abd al-Qadir Jilani via Sheikh Jamal al-Din Yunus b. Yahya al-'Abbas.³⁴⁹ As we can see, for the names after Ibn Arabi, the chain Sivasi gave is actually an accurate chain of Qadiriyya. However, it gets confusing in the names before Ibn 'Arabi. Because, there is no chain that connects Ibn 'Arabi with Zayn-al Din Khwafi and the name in the midst of them, i.e. Sheikh 'Abd al-Nur, is an ambiguous name since Khwafi has no sheikh and Ibn 'Arabi has no disciple in that name.

Khwafi's sheikh's name is Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman al-Misri and name of his sheikh is Jamal al-Din Yusuf Gurani.³⁵⁰ It is a possibility that Sivasi made a mistake when he is writing his chain. First mistake he made is actually an explicit one. The name of Sivasi's sheikh is not Zayn al-Din al-Misri but Zayn-al Din Khwafi. The one who comes from Egypt is actually the sheikh of Khwafi. The second probable mistake Sivasi made is about the name of Khwafi's sheikh. Sivasi probably confused his name, which is Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman, and wrote it as 'Abd al-Nur. The third probable mistake Sivasi

³⁴⁷ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 70; Fatih Çınar, "Bir Mutasavvıf Olarak Şihâbüddin Es-Sivâsî ve Cezzâbü'l-Kulûb İsimli Eseri Bağlamında Bazı Tasavvufi Görüşleri," *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, no. 37 (2013/1): 247.

³⁴⁸ Sadık Vicdani, "Kadiriyye," in *Tomar-ı Turuk-ı Aliyye*, (İstanbul: Daru'l-Hilafetu'l-Aliyye ve Matbaa-i Amire, 1338-1340), 11-12.

³⁴⁹ Vassaf, *Sefine-i Evliya*, 1:72.

³⁵⁰ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 547.

made is the one in the connection of Ibn 'Arabi with sheikh Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman since name of sheikhs of both of Ibn Arabi and Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman contains the name of Jamal al-Din.

The chain Sivasi gave is an accurate chain of Zayniyya in some parts, as it is given by 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi.³⁵¹ However, this accuracy vanishes after Junayd Baghdadi. Sivasi's chain also suits to Qudsi's chain after the name of Sheikh 'Abd al-Nur, if we accept that he confused the name of Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahman with 'Abd al-Nur. The obvious mistake here is in the middle of Sheikh 'Abd al-Nur and Junayd Baghdadi. Sivasi's chain is a chain composed of two different orders, namely Zayniyya and Qadiriyya.

All biographical sources agree Sivasi's affiliation with Zayniyya order. However, this affiliation may not have much of an importance for Sivasi. In his *Risala al-Najat*, we see no reference about his affiliation with the Zayniyya order. Moreover, his approach to the issue of companionship/conversation vs. seclusion indicates his contrast with the approach of Khwafi.

In his *Jazzab al-Qulub*, there are two important issues in that sense. First is the chapter of saints and prophet. In this passage, Sivasi explains the difference between these two groups with respect to miracle. However, he does not get into the discussion of supremacy between prophethood and sainthood. Secondly, he gives a false chain of order when we consider the chain of Zayniyya order. The chain of Khwafi has no relation with Ibn 'Arabi and the rest of Sivasi's chain is actually the chain of Qadiriyya, which is called *silsila al-dhahab*. Öngören states one of the chains of the order of Zayniyya reaches 'Abd al-Qadir Jilani, however this chain ends with the first khalifa Abu Bakr,³⁵² unlike the *silsila al-dhahab*.

As the result of these indications, we can conclude that Sivasi most probably confused the chain of Qadiriyya with Zayniyya. Hence, his inclusion of Ibn 'Arabi to his chain of

³⁵¹ Ibid., 551.

³⁵² Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 13.

order does not have much of significance with respect to our inquiry. There is another reason for our claim. It is that in Sivasî's two books of Sufism, he never refers to Ibn 'Arabi, except the mistake above. An example of that is the passage where he compared the prophets and saints with each other. He does not do that with an Akbari perspective.

5. 3. Molla Fenari (d. 1431)

I mentioned the affiliation of Molla Fenari with Akbari School in the previous pages. Moreover, modern scholars who study him agree on the fact that he was one of the greatest representatives of Akbari School in Anatolia during the fifteenth century.³⁵³ Therefore, his affiliation with Akbari School will not be explained in a detailed manner.

Stanford Shaw posits Molla Fenari as the key figure for establishing the doctrine of oneness of being (*wahda al-wujud*) in the intellectual framework of the Ottoman State. He says, "They [Davud Kayseri and Molla Fenari] introduced the major Arabic works into Turkish while making Muhyiddin 'Arabi's ideas on the oneness of being the bases of the philosophical and religious systems then being created among the ulama being trained to staff the Learned Institution of the nascent Ottoman State."³⁵⁴ Molla Fenari, as the first officially appointed sheikh al-Islam of the Ottoman State³⁵⁵, places Akbari doctrines to the very foundation of intellectual field that is in the process of institutionalization.

There is no doubt on the intimacy of Molla Fenari with the Akbari School yet his choice of the spiritual order seems like a problematic issue since it is suggested that

³⁵³ Mustafa Aşkar, "Osmanlı Devletinde Alim-Mutasavvıf Prototipi Olarak; İlk Şeyhülislam Molla Fenari ve Tasavvuf Anlayışı," *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 37, no. 1 (1997): 388; Demirli, *Tasavvufun Altın Çağı*, 18-19; Alan Godlas, "Molla Fanârî and the *Mişbâh al-Uns*: The Commentator and The Perfect Man." In *International Symposium on Molla Fanârî –Proceedings-*, edited by Tefvik Yücedoğru, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu, U. Murat Kılavuz, and Kadir Gömbeyaz (Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010), 31-32; Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 169; Reşat Öngören, *Osmanlılar'da Tasavvuf Anadolu'da Sufiler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVI. Yüzyıl)* (İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012), 22.

³⁵⁴ Stanford Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. 1, *Empire of the Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808* (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 144.

³⁵⁵ Aşkar, "İlk Şeyhülislam Molla Fenari," 392-93; Yıldırım and Yılmaz, "Molla Fanârî," 76.

he affiliates with many Sufi orders. In the oldest sources that mention Molla Fenari such as *Inba al-Gumr bi Ebna al-Umr* of Ibn Hajar and *History of Aşıkpaşazade*, there is no record about Molla Fenari's affiliation with any Sufi order. In these sources, he shines out with his competence in the Islamic sciences.³⁵⁶

In the later sources, Molla Fenari is linked with five Sufi orders. These are Akbariyya, Rifa'iyya, Abhariyya/Awhadiyya, Safawiyya/Ardabiliyya, and Zayniyya. Taşköprizade suggests Molla Fenari meets with Somuncu Baba of Safawiyya and learns Sufism from him and indicates he also affiliates with Zayniyya via 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi by referring to the poems they wrote to each other.³⁵⁷

The reason of suggesting such an affiliation with Somuncu Baba is most probably Molla Fenari's famous meeting with Somuncu Baba in Bursa during the inauguration of Ulucami. According to anecdote, Bayezid II asks Emir Sultan to preach in the inauguration of Ulucami. Emir Buhari does not accept it since the pole of the age is Somuncu Baba. He asks from Somuncu Baba to preach. Somuncu Baba accepts it and gives a seven-layered exegesis of Surah al-Fatiha. Molla Fenari says, I did not understand after the third layer. After preach, Molla Fenari goes to Somuncu Baba to ask about the parts he did not understand. According to anecdote, Molla Fenari's *'Ayn al-A'yan* is written after this speech. However, in the earlier sources like *Shaqa'iq* there is not a direct record that suggests Molla Fenari became disciple of Somuncu Baba. Also, Molla Fenari's first meeting takes place in the inauguration of Ulucami and after his preach in Ulucami, Somuncu Baba leaves Bursa immediately since he abstains from reputation. Because of this reason, Molla Fenari's discipleship of Somuncu Baba does not seem possible.³⁵⁸

Bursalı Mehmed Tahir suggests Molla Fenari affiliates with Akbariyya via his father Molla Hamza, with Zayniyya via Abd al-Latif Qudsi, and with Ardabiliyya via Somuncu

³⁵⁶ Abdurrezzak Tek, "Molla Fenârî'nin Tasavvufî Kimliği" In *International Symposium on Molla Fanârî –Proceedings–*, edited by Tefvik Yücedoğru, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu, U. Murat Kılavuz, and Kadir Gömbeyaz, 441-42. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010.

³⁵⁷ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 26.

³⁵⁸ Tek, "Molla Fenari," 449-451.

Baba.³⁵⁹ Vassaf repeats these three orders but adds one more sheikh. He is a saint called Abdal Mehmed and first sheikh of Molla Fenari. Vassaf also says that Qudsi gives authority of servicing as a sheikh to Molla Fenari.³⁶⁰

The main reason of suggesting such an adhesion for Molla Fenari to the Akbariyya is the incorrect record that shows Molla Fenari's father Molla Hamza as disciple of Qunawi. This is impossible since there is almost two centuries between Molla Hamza and Qunawi. Also, another error made in this suggestion is to accept Akbari School as a Sufi order. Akbari School is an intellectual and spiritual disposition not a classical Sufi order since it has never had an active lodge that is called with its own name, as we mentioned.

Akhlati, in his *Munawwar al-Azkar fi Dhikr silsilat al-Mashayikh* writes a Rifa'i chain of order for Molla Fenari.³⁶¹ According to this chain, sheikh of Molla Fenari is Sheikh 'Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad al-Hanafi el-Bistami. However, Bistami, in his *Kitab Durrat Taj al-Rasa'il wa Ghurrat Minhaj al-Wasa'il*, mentions Molla Fenari's life, books, teachers, and students and says about him only that Molla Fenari became student of him. Also Taşköprizade writes in *Shaqa'iq* that Molla Fenari meets with Bistami in Bursa and learned from him branches of Arabic grammar. These two sources do not mention Molla Fenari's Sufism oriented discipleship to Bistami. It seems there is no more than a teacher-student relation between Molla Fenari and Bistami. Otherwise, Bistami would mention discipleship of him.³⁶²

The reason of ascribing an Abhariyya/Awhadiyya chain of order to Molla Fenari is same with Akbariyya. In the chain, it is suggested that Molla Fenari takes authority in Sufism from his father Molla Hamza, and Molla Hamza takes authority from Sadr al-din Qunawi. According to this chain, Qunawi is disciple of Awhad al-Din Kirmani (d.

³⁵⁹ Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir Efendi, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, ed. A. Fikri Yavuz and İsmail Özen (İstanbul: Meral Yayınevi), 1:314.

³⁶⁰ Vassaf, *Sefine-i Evliya*, 1:326.

³⁶¹ Tek, "Molla Fenari," 445.

³⁶² Ibid., 446-47.

1238). As we mentioned above, Molla Hamza's meeting with Qunawi is historically impossible.

Molla Fenari's intimacy with Zayniyya order is not certain. However, there are strong indications. In the sources, it is suggested that Molla Fenari became disciple of Qudsi during his second visit to Anatolia, in 1447.³⁶³ This meeting is impossible since Molla Fenari dies in 1431. Molla Fenari's first meeting with Zayniyya should be either with Khwafi during Muhammed Parsa's funeral in Medina or with Qudsi during his first visit to Anatolia in 1425. There is no reliable record that suggests Molla Fenari's discipleship to neither Khwafi nor Qudsi. However, because of the strong indications, which we will mention now, it is possible to say if Molla Fenari became disciple of any five Sufi orders mentioned in this chapter, it is Zayniyya order.

In this sense, poems Qudsi and Molla Fenari wrote for each other have great significance. When Qudsi entered to Anatolia during his first visit, Molla Fenari writes a poem that praises Qudsi greatly. In this poem, Molla Fenari starts with the verse of "The most auspical among people who came to Anatolia". In the first verse of the poem Qudsi wrote as reply, he says, "Imam of the century, you are unique in science and reason in this age."³⁶⁴ Following verses of Molla Fenari's poem have great significance that shows Fenari's desire for being disciple of Qudsi. Fenari says, "His name is 'Abd al-Latif b. Ghanim/I swear, Fenari is aspirant for him/But I am defective/I yearned for going to him/This servant waited in Jerusalem with hope/For spending rest of my life there/.../Then, stand up and meet with this wise man, he [Qudsi] is an exception in our age/Become his servant as long as he is alive."³⁶⁵

As we see in the verses, Molla Fenari goes to Jerusalem for meeting with Qudsi. However, for a reason we do not know, he cannot meet him. However, Qudsi came to Anatolia and Molla Fenari is eager to meet him and become his servant this time.

³⁶³ Ibid., 453.

³⁶⁴ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 316. See the appendix 4 of Tek's book for these poems.

³⁶⁵ Ibid.

The second indication that shows Molla Fenari's intimacy with Zayniyya is his tombstone. Today, his tombstone is devastated because of the terrible restoration. It is newly built and does not reflect the feature of any Sufi order. However, Molla Fenari's original tombstone typifies the stones of the Zayniyya order.³⁶⁶ The top of these stones is in the shape of a triangle and becomes thinner in the below. Its shape resembles the shape of diamond. In the graveyard of Molla Fenari mosque, there are six tombstones that are in the shape of Zayni tombstone at present. There were probably a lot more Zayni tombstones in this graveyard in the earlier years. These tombstones show that, the mosque of Molla Fenari was a gathering place for Zayniyya disciples during and after the age of Molla Fenari. Moreover, Molla Fenari himself was most probably a Zayni disciple since his tombstone is in the shape of Zayni tombstones.

Tek suggests that Molla Fenari never became disciple of any sheikh and never served as a sheikh for any Sufi order. He is not part of any chain of Sufi orders. However, he agrees on the fact that the Sufi order Molla Fenari became most intimate is Zayniyya.³⁶⁷ We agree his suggestion of Fenari never served as a sheikh. However, we also suggest that Molla Fenari is disciple of Qudsi. The verses that show Fenari's desire for being the disciple of Qudsi and shape of Fenari's tombstone are sufficient evidences for our suggestion.

5. 4. Kutbüddinzade İzniki (d. 1480)

His name is Molla Mehmet İzniki. He is a prominent scholar of the age of Murat II and Mehmed II. He participates in the campaigns of Eğriboz and Boğdan of Mehmed II and composed the prayers that should be read by soldiers.³⁶⁸

He is student of Molla Fenari and studies Islamic and rational sciences with him. After he finishes his studies, he affiliates with Sufism.³⁶⁹ However, there is no record that

³⁶⁶ Hicabi Gülgen, "Molla Fenârî Camii Haziresi Mezar Taşları" In *International Symposium on Molla Fanârî –Proceedings-*, edited by Tefik Yücedoğru, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu, U. Murat Kılavuz, and Kadir Gömbeyaz, 113-14. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010.

³⁶⁷ Tek, "Molla Fenari," 455-58.

³⁶⁸ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 162.

³⁶⁹ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 107.

states Molla Mehmet's sheikh in the sources.³⁷⁰ There are strong indications that show his intimacy with Zayniyya order. First is, in his book *Sharh Subhanaka ma 'Arafnaka Haqq Ma'rifatika*, he mentions from Khwafi and praises him greatly by saying "our master (*seyyiduna*), sultan of the saints (*sultan al-awliya*), and inheritor of seal of saints (*warith khatm al-awliya*). He also writes a commentary on the Zayniyya litanies, by the name of *Tanwir al-Awrad*. In this book, he adds new sections.³⁷¹ These are strong indications of Kutbüddinzade's intimacy with Zayniyya order. He, like his teacher Molla Fenari, did not serve as a sheikh but he is most probably a disciple of Zayniyya order.

We mentioned İzniki's affiliation of Akbari School and his commentary on Qunawi's *Miftah al-Ghayb*. İzniki also writes another book called *Mudhil al-Shakk fi Aqşam al-Kafara*. This book is also known by the name of *Risala fi Qawl Ibn 'Arabi fi Iman Fir'awn*. This book has a great significance with respect to context of our thesis. The book will be examined in detail. There are many copies of this book in the libraries of Istanbul. We used the copy in Ragıp Paşa since Mehmed Tahir suggests this copy is ascribed by Kutbüddinzade İzniki³⁷² and Öngören says this copy is controlled by İzniki and he wrote the notes on the margins of the pages.³⁷³

İzniki says he wrote the book in pursuit of clarifying two problematic issues related with Ibn 'Arabi. First is about statement on the faith of Pharaoh and the second is about the state of infidels in hell. As we mentioned above, Ibn 'Arabi suggests that Pharaoh died as a believer and people in hell will stay there but will be given a kind of comfort. Fire will stop burning inhabitant of hell and they will fall into an eternal sleep and they will see beautiful things in their dreams.

İzniki praises Ibn 'Arabi with adjectives of "leader of sheikh, gnostic, and verifier (*sadr al-sheikh al-'arif al-muhaqqiq*). This adjectives show that İzniki shows Ibn 'Arabi great respect. However, İzniki does not explain the issue of Pharaoh in detail. He just

³⁷⁰ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 162; Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 104.

³⁷¹ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 104-105; Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 162-63.

³⁷² Mehmed Tâhir Efendi, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, 1:148.

³⁷³ Reşat Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde İznikî," DİA.

says, “This is not the time to explain this issue. If the time lets us, we will explain Ibn ‘Arabi’s intention in another book.”³⁷⁴ We understand that it is a fevered issue during the age. He probably refrains from reactions that may occur against him. However, İzniki notes on the margin of the page that “Pharaoh believed in God during the state of desperation. His creed is compulsory not voluntary.”³⁷⁵ This statement is usually used by scholars who are in the counter-view of Ibn Arabi’s statement. They say Pharaoh’s creed is not accepted since it is compulsory. İzniki’s approach must be an interesting one since he first praises Ibn ‘Arabi and then disagrees on his statement about Pharaoh’s faith. He says that I will explain the real intention of Ibn ‘Arabi. His approach is intriguing. Unfortunately we do not know İzniki’s view since there is no book devoted to this issue, as we know yet.

Major part of the book is related with the state of infidels. İzniki follows the approach of Imam Ghazzali on the subject.

He starts with a categorization about people who are called as infidels. He splits them into three groups. First group consists of people who live in the borderlands of Anatolia (*Bilad-i Rum*). The message of Islam did not reach them. They did not hear the name of Prophet Muhammad yet. They are forgiven. The second group consists of people who hear name, attribute, and miracles of Prophet Muhammad. They do not accept the message of Islam. They are infidels and will be punished. Third group consists of people who are between these two groups. The name of Prophet Muhammad reached them but his attributes did not. They are like the first group, which means they are forgiven. Then, he refers Imam Ghazzali on the subject. According to İzniki, Imam Ghazzali says, “The person who is trying to achieve his goal on the right path is forgiven as long as he does not renounce. He is forgiven even if he did not achieve it.”³⁷⁶

³⁷⁴ Kutbüddinzade İzniki, *Risala fi Qawl Ibn ‘Arabi fi Iman Fir‘awn*, (SK, Ragıp Paşa, no: 692), 223a.

³⁷⁵ Ibid., 222b.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., 223a.

Then he distinguishes the physical torment from the spiritual torment. He argues the subject of body's and soul's eternal torment in hell. One of the most prominent features of the book is that İzniki gives place to all approaches and their evidences in the book. According to him, some suggest that both body and soul will suffer eternally in hell. And some say only soul will suffer eternally.³⁷⁷ On the issue, İzniki's suggestion is that torment of body will end but torment of soul will continue forever. Then, he explains torment of soul. He says that the torment of soul is more agonizing than the fire of hell. The torment of soul is distance from God. It is so severe that only hearts can feel it. The fire of hell only damages bodies but the fire of distance annihilates everything.³⁷⁸

After İzniki explains the differences between the torment of body and the soul, he refers to Imam Ghazzali and Tirmidhi (d. 932) in their suggestion of suffer in hell will end after 7000 years. Then, he mentions a divine inspiration (*kashf*) that appeared in his heart. He says, "Know that, before this poor man saw this time period in their books, it appeared to me that maximum time in hell for the people who are going to leave there will be 7.000 years. Because, the sign of Virgo completes its circle in 7.000 years."³⁷⁹

İzniki, in his *Risala*, mentions two problematic issues of Ibn 'Arabi. These are Ibn 'Arabi's statement on Pharaoh's faith and state of infidels in hell. This commentator of *Miftah al-Ghayb* and prominent student of Molla Fenari does not share Ibn 'Arabi's approach on the issues. He suggests that Pharaoh's belief is a faith of desperation (*iman al-ya'is*). This is the view shared by scholars who suggest Pharaoh died as an infidel. About the second issue, İzniki seems to be in a close approach with Ibn 'Arabi. But the main name İzniki followed is Imam Ghazzali. He says, the torment of body will end in 7.000 years but the torment of soul will continue forever. According to İzniki, the torment of soul is distance from God. As we mentioned in Cahpet IV, Ibn 'Arabi claims that torment of infidels in hell will continue for 50.000 years.

³⁷⁷ Ibid., 223b-224a.

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 224b.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 225a.

We set some benchmarks, in Chapter 4, to indicate intimacy of Zayni sheikhs with Akbari School. İzniki's *Risala* promises to explain two titles of these benchmarks, Pharaoh's belief and state of infidels in hell. We suggested that Sufis who feel themselves as a part of the Akbari School usually tend to defend Ibn 'Arabi in these issues and argues that Ibn 'Arabi is wrongly understood. However, İzniki, as an obvious Akbari figure, contradicts with our suggestion. He accepts faith of Pharaoh as a faith of desperation and does not see it as an accepted one. In the issue of state of infidels in hell, he shows a closer stance to Ibn 'Arabi however he does not refer him. He shows Imam Ghazzali and Tirmidhi as the proponent of this statement and asserts that he agrees with them.

5. 5. Piri Halife Hamidi (d. 1460)

Piri Halife is disciple of 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi and effective at Zayniyya's emanation in Anatolia. He writes a famous commentary to Qunawi's *Nusus* by the name of *Zubdat al-Tahqiq wa Nuzhat al-Tawfiq*. In this book, he writes his name as Pir Muhammad b. Qutb al-Din al-Huyi al-Hanafi.³⁸⁰ He is from the city of Huy, Persia. He dies on 8 August 1460.³⁸¹ Information about his biography is limited with these, in the sources.

Piri Halife's meeting with Qudsi is recorded in *Nafahat* in the chapter of Taceddin İbrahim Karamani (d. 872/1467). Karamani is an important figure for Zayniyya order. He is disciple of Abdullatif Qudsi and served as sheikh in the Bursa lodge after him. According to record in *Nafahat*, when Qudsi was in Konya, Piri Halife, who is sheikh al-Islam's son-in-law, was teaching in madrasa in Eğirdir³⁸². Taceddin İbrahim is his student and was reading *Mutawwal*³⁸³ from him. Piri Halife hears that Qudsi is in Konya and he decides to visit him. When he is going to Konya he takes Taceddin İbrahim as company. Piri Halife and Taceddin İbrahim becomes disciples of Qudsi during this visit. Piri Halife serves Qudsi for a while, then, asks permission of Qudsi to

³⁸⁰ Piri Halife Hamidi, *Zubdat al-Tahqiq wa Nuzhat al-Tawfiq*, (SK, Ayasofya, no: 4805), 34a.

³⁸¹ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 118-19; Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 57.

³⁸² Eğirdir is Isparta's district. It is located in the southwest of modern Turkey.

³⁸³ A famous Arabic rhetoric book written by Taftazan,. See the article of "Miftâhu'l-Ulûm" in DİA for further information.

return to Eğirdir. Qudsi says, “Give us Taceddin.” Piri Halife accepts his wish and returns home. He serves as a Zayni sheikh in Eğirdir for the rest of his life.³⁸⁴

In this record, Piri Halife’s father-in-law is an important figure. His name is Bardai and came from Persia at the request of governor of Hamid-ili, Hızır Bey. Sheikh al-Islam Bardai is a sheikh but his Sufi order is not known. However, it is recorded that he met with Hacı Bayram Veli when he came to Anatolia. Before Piri Halife meets with Qudsi, he serves under his father-in-law Bardai. He is Bardai’s disciple and caliph. Piri Halife serves as sheikh in the Eğirdir lodge after death of his father-in-law.³⁸⁵ Piri Halife serves as a Zayni sheikh in this lodge after he visits Qudsi.

Zubdat al-Tahqiq is a commentary to Qunawi’s *al-Nusus fī Tahqiq al-Tawr al-Makhsus*. *Nusus* is written as a *nazira*³⁸⁶ to Ibn Arabi’s *Fusus*.³⁸⁷ The book is composed of 22 short chapters. Qunawi, in a way, summarizes his ideas in his other books in *Nusus* in a pithy way.

Piri Halife, in *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*, explains the complicated issues in *Nusus*. He mostly explains the issues by using catechetic method. He first asks a possible question about a complicated issue, then, answers it. When he is answering these questions, he usually refers other books of Qunawi such as *al-Nafaḥat al-Ilahiyya*³⁸⁸, *Tafsir al-Fatiha (i’jaz al-Bayan fī Tafsir Umm al-Qur’an)*³⁸⁹, and *Miftah al-Ghayb*³⁹⁰. He also refers to classical Sufi books like *Awarif al-Ma’arif*³⁹¹ and verses from Qur’an and hadiths.

³⁸⁴ Lami Çelebi, *Nafaḥat*, 555-56.

³⁸⁵ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 119; Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 57.

³⁸⁶ *Nazira* is a literary genre. Literal works that are written in this genre are the similar of another work. This genre is widely used in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish literature. See the article of “Nazîre” in DİA for further information.

³⁸⁷ Osman Ergin, “Şadraddîn al-Qunawi ve Eserleri,” *Şarkiyat Mecmuası* 64, no. 2 (1957): 65.

³⁸⁸ Piri Halife, *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*, 43b.

³⁸⁹ Ibid., 46b.

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 50a.

³⁹¹ Ibid., 46a.

On the first page of book, when Piri Halife is explaining the reason of writing this book, he says that he was giving lecture of *Nusus* to his disciples. He says that during this lecture occurred a kind of divine inspiration that related with all phrases in the book. He says that some issues came from God and these issues were not merit of his station. These issues came to an ability of spiritual tasting (*dhawq*³⁹²). He says that what the perfect master, i.e. Sadr al-Din Qunawi, wrote in his some books are evidences what he said.³⁹³

After this part, starts the introduction chapter. In this part, he summarizes the book. After the introduction part, he starts commenting. The parts written by Qunawi are inscribed in red ink and comments of Piri Halife are written in black ink. *Zubdat al-Tahqiq* is a large book that interprets *Nusus* in detail. For example, only interpretation of the *basmala* continues for eleven pages. Piri Halife examines it in various aspects. Hence, examination of the book in its entirety exceeds the scope of this thesis. We will only mention the parts related with our context.

On the page 113b, the anecdote of Pharaoh and Prophet Moses is mentioned. Prophet Moses saves Israelites from cruelty and magic of Pharaoh. However, they do not satisfy and ask for more. In the end they repent and ask for forgiveness of Prophet Moses and God.³⁹⁴

After thirty pages, the issue of Pharaoh is mentioned again but this time in a different context. When Piri Halife is explaining the soul, soul self (*nafs*) and relation of love with them, he refers to surah of Shu'ara, verse 21 that says, "So I fled from you when I feared you. Then my Lord granted me wisdom and prophethood and appointed me [as one] of the messengers." The verse is the part of the anecdote that tells suffocation of Pharaoh in the Red Sea. Piri Halife mentions the name of Pharaoh and

³⁹² An element of spiritual experience describing an essential dimension of the seeker's relationship to God. Tasting (*dhawq*) is related metaphorically to imbibing the intoxicating beverage of the divine presence. Some authors, such as Abu Hamid al-Ghazali, use the term to distinguish firsthand experience from mere intellectual or notional assent to a truth. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 236.

³⁹³ Piri Halife, *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*, 33a.

³⁹⁴ Ibid., 113b-114a.

suggests the real meaning of the verse is that, Prophet Moses escaped because he likes salvation from Pharaoh.³⁹⁵

Significant aspect of these pages, with respect to our context, is that there is no comment about the faith of Pharaoh.

In *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*, there is only one part directly related to state of people in hell. In this part, Piri Halife mentions the people of hell. This is a short part and he only gives the surahs related to people of hell like Surah al-Sajdah/13 that says, "And if we had willed, We could have given every soul its guidance, but the word from Me will come into effect [that] 'I will surely fill Hell with jinn and people all together.'" Hell is punishment for people who do not accept servanthood to God. According to Piri Halife, God says, in a sacred saying (*hadith qudsi*)³⁹⁶ that, "My mercy overcame my torment." However, according to Piri Halife, for the people who do not accept servanthood will not be influenced by His mercy.³⁹⁷ This issue is related with another problematic issue of Ibn 'Arabi, which is the state of infidels in hell. Piri Halife chooses not to debate it as in the case of faith of Pharaoh.

Piri Halife does not show the same silence in the issue of supremacy of sainthood over prophethood, which is another problematic issue related with Ibn 'Arabi. In the last pages of *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*, he adopts Ibn Arabi's statement of sainthood is superior to prophethood. This comparison is also made in *Nusus* either. He starts this debate by referring to that part of *Nusus*. He says that, "I heard from a wise [sufi] man that sainthood is superior to prophethood."³⁹⁸ He agrees with him and explains the real meaning of this sentence. According to Piri Halife, this sentence does not mean that saints are superior to prophets. This comparison is made with respect to

³⁹⁵ Ibid., 148b.

³⁹⁶ In addition to the sayings of the Prophet, Muslim tradition has also preserved in a place of honor a large number of hadiths attributed to God Himself. Known as "sacred sayings" (*ahadith qudsiya*), these form an amazing treasure trove in which Sufis over the centuries have found insights into the essential features of the divine-human relationship. For the mystics, these sacred traditions reveal God's very heart, so to speak, one that is immanently accessible and desirous of being known. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 99-100.

³⁹⁷ Piri Halife, *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*, 185b.

³⁹⁸ Ibid., 195b.

prophet's inner characteristics. These two aspects are found in one person who is the prophet. And comparison means, a prophet's sainthood is superior to his prophethood.³⁹⁹

This approach reflects Ibn 'Arabi's statement on the issue. As we mentioned in the Chapter 4, according to Ibn 'Arabi, level of sainthood encircles all levels. Accordingly, for a person who has both of the levels of sainthood and prophethood, the level of sainthood is superior. A saint who accepts Prophet Muhammad as his prophet can never become superior to him. In other words, according to Ibn 'Arabi, this statement does not mean that a saint can be superior to prophets. It means sainthood of a prophet is superior to his prophethood.⁴⁰⁰

Piri Halife was a Zayni sheikh who teaches *Nusus* and writes a commentary to it. But he was not always a Zayni sheikh. Bardai was his sheikh before Qudsi. His influence maybe the reason of Piri Halife's intimacy with Akbari School. Detailed studies on this Persian sheikh may shed light to Piri Halife's intellectual inclinations. However, we are not in an absolute darkness about Piri Halife.

He used to know Qudsi before he came to Anatolia and respect him greatly. When he was allowed to serve as a sheikh in Eğirdir by his father-in-law, Bardai, he went to Qudsi to serve him. He became a Zayni sheikh. What is interesting is that, he started to serve as a Zayni sheikh when he returned to Eğirdir in his old lodge.

He wrote a commentary to *Nusus* of Qunawi. He chose not to explain the issues of creed of Pharaoh and state of infidels in hell, which are among the issues of heated debates during the age. However, he mentioned the issue of comparison of sainthood with prophethood.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 196a.

⁴⁰⁰ M. Mustafa Çakmaklıoğlu, "İbnü'l-Arabî'nin Nübüvvet-Velayet Hakkındaki Görüşleri ve İbn Teymiyye'nin Bu Husustaki Eleştirileri," *Tasavvuf* 21 (2008): 213.

The reason of this choice was probably that Qunawi either did not mention of the issues of Pharaoh and infidels in his *Nusus*. The context of the issues of Pharaoh and infidels were letting Piri Halife to manifest his approach about the issues. But he did not mention them because he was most probably not feeling himself obliged to by contrast with Sheikh Vefa. Probable difference between them was the intellectual environment, which they live in. These problematic issues related with Ibn 'Arabi were probably not heated or popular in Eğirdir as they were in Istanbul.

5. 6. Sheikh Vefa (d. 1491)

Sheikh Vefa is an important disciple of Qudsi. He has great influence on expansion of Zayniyya order in Anatolia, Balkans and Istanbul. In his time, many scholars and bureaucrats have been disciple of Vefa.

Sheikh Vefa is from Konya. His exact date of birth is not given in any sources. However, Erdemir suggests it should be in the first quarter of the 15th century since he became famous during the reign of Karamanoğlu İbrahim Bey (d. 868/1463) and he is the disciple of 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi.⁴⁰¹

In the sources he is called with many names. In *Nafahat*, Lami Çelebi writes his name as "Sheikh Wafa al-Qunawi". He also says, "On the back of a book I saw, written with his own script, 'He who wrote this book is al-Faqir Mustafa b. Ahmad al-Sadr al-Qunawi known as Wafa.'⁴⁰² In the *Shaqa'iq*, Taşköprizade gives his name as "Wafa." Then he says, "And among them al-Sheikh al-'Arif billah al-Sheikh Muslih al-Din famous with the name of Ibn al-Wafa." Taşköprizade adds, "he wrote his name on the back of some of his books," and gives his name same with Lami Çelebi's record.⁴⁰³ Öngören says, in the sources his name passes as "Ebulvefa", "İbnülvefâ/İbn Vefâ", and "Vefâzâde". He uses Vefa in his poems as nickname. Öngören gives many other names for Sheikh Vefa and he says, "It is understood that, names like Ebulvefa, İbnülvefa or Vefazade were not being used because he was son of a man named Vefa

⁴⁰¹ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 27.

⁴⁰² Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 559.

⁴⁰³ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 237-38.

or because he had a son named Vefa. There are no records about a Vefa from the family of Sheikh Vefa. These were just simple usages for him.”⁴⁰⁴ We chose to use his name as Öngören did, Sheikh Vefa.

Sheikh Vefa’s first sheikh is Muslihuddin Halife (d. 1443) also known as Debbağlar İmamı. There is not much information about the life of Muslihuddin Halife. Taşköprizade does not give his date of death, however, Hüseyin Vassaf gives this date as 1443 in his *Sefîne-i Evliyâ*.⁴⁰⁵ The tariqa of Muslihuddin Mustafa is uncertain. However, in *Shaqa’iq*, it is said that Qudsi praises Muslihuddin Halife greatly and says, “He is a sea among the seas of truth.”⁴⁰⁶ In this manner, Muslihuddin Halife and Qudsi probably knew each other personally. Accordingly, Muslihuddin Halife sends Sheikh Vefa to ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi for him to complete his initiation. In the light of this information, we can say, Muslihuddin Halife was probably a Zayni Sheikh but his Sheikh is unknown.

Sheikh Vefa was a polymath. He had deep knowledge of exoteric and esoteric sciences. He used to know sciences of music and astronomy (and astrology). He was an expert in preparing *wafq*.⁴⁰⁷ He used to write great poems and proses. His sermon was fluent. In the beginning of compilation of his litanies, it is said, “He is the best scholar of his time, competent on the methods and branches (*usul wa furu’*) of sciences, able to decipher the signs in Qur’an and hadiths, master of exegetes, source of the narrators of hadiths.”⁴⁰⁸ An incident recited in *Shaqa’iq* reveals Sheikh Vefa’s degree in science. According to text, he was following the Hanafi sect. However, he used to recite *basmala* out loud where he should not do according to the sect. Scholars found this situation wrong. Molla Sinan Paşa (891/1486), who is the disciple of Sheikh Vefa, answers their questions and says, “Who knows maybe he formed a new legal opinion (*ijtihad*)”. Then scholars asked, “Does he fulfill the conditions

⁴⁰⁴ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 130-132.

⁴⁰⁵ Vassaf, *Sefîne-i Evliya*, 1:328.

⁴⁰⁶ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa’iq*, 112.

⁴⁰⁷ A kind of charm or talisman composed of a written scheme, folded square or in triangular form or rolled. For this, see Sir James W. Redhouse, *Turkish and English Lexion New Edition* (İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 2011), 2144.

⁴⁰⁸ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 132-33.

necessary for forming a legal opinion?” Sinan Paşa answered, “Yes, I testify he does.” Scholars accepted his testimony and never talked against Sheikh Vefa.⁴⁰⁹

What Sheikh Vefa did is actually a coherent deed in Shafi'i sect. In *Nafahat*, where the event is recorded, Lami Çelebi notes that, “[Sheikh Vefa does it] as Shafi'is do.”⁴¹⁰ So, what Sheikh Vefa did is not a new *ijtihad* as Sinan Paşa suggested. Sheikh Vefa, in this situation, actually acts according to advices of Khwafi. Khwafi advises his disciples to integrate all Sunni sects.⁴¹¹ It maybe wrong for Ottoman ulama when a Hanafi acts like a Shafi'i. However, this was what advised by Khwafi to his disciples.

This incident gives a good picture of Vefa's degree in Islamic sciences. In general, required conditions in forming legal opinion are two. First is comprehending all sources of sharia and second is comprising the branches, methods and rules that will work for forming the legal opinion.⁴¹² In short, what is required for forming such an opinion is that comprehending almost all of the legal Islamic sciences.

This is not the only case of debate between Sheikh Vefa and Ottoman ulama. Sheikh Vefa and his disciples used to recite litanies out load and perform audition (*sama*)⁴¹³ as disciples in Mawlawiyya order did. This type of audition aroused attention of Molla Gürani (d. 1488) who is among the muftis of the age. He wrote a fatwa and sent it to Sheikh Vefa. In the fatwa it says, “Who is that mujtahid that creates a new sect on his own and perform dance (*raqs*)⁴¹⁴ and imitates the infidels?” Sheikh Vefa writes his

⁴⁰⁹ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 239.

⁴¹⁰ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 559-60.

⁴¹¹ Köle, *Zeynüddin*, 157.

⁴¹² See the article of “İctihad” in DİA for further information.

⁴¹³ A category of Sufi ritual much contested because it involves the use of music, which mainstream Muslim tradition has generally condemned because of its emotional power and soul-altering properties. Audition (*sama*) often also incorporates the recitation of sacred text and poetry as well as various forms of ritual movement or dance. While some Sufis have argued against the practice, many Sufi organizations have regarded audition as an essential ingredient of spiritual practice and have evolved their own distinctive forms. Perhaps the best known is the whirling dance of the Mawlawiyya, set to the music of an instrumental group with the reed flute (*ney*) as its lead voice. Some Sufis have considered audition as a reliving of the Day of Covenant. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 39-40.

⁴¹⁴ Rhythmic movement (commonly called *raqs*.), whether elaborately choreographed or allowing for spontaneity, that is an element in the paraliturgical ritual of many orders. Although the whirling dance that has become the hallmark of the Mawlawiyya is by far the best known example of Sufi dance, there are other important examples as well. Many involve some form of circle formation with oscillating,

answer under the fatwa and says, “What do these people say that you labeled as dancers?” Molla Gürani answers, “They sing.” Sheikh Vefa answers, “What do they sing?” Molla Gürani answers, “They say *la ilaha illa allah*”. Sheikh Vefa answers again and says, “There is a group of infidels. They ring bells and dance and sing. And there is another group of Muslims they are engaging in reciting the litanies (*dhikr*). What can I answer to the one who cannot distinguish these two groups from each other?” The paper that consists all those answers stay at Molla Gürani and he keeps silent.⁴¹⁵

Issues of audition (*sama'*) and dance (*raqs*) have been vehement subjects of debate throughout the Sufi history. The issue is beyond the limits of this text. However, there is another important issue related to our context. In the quotation, it says, Sheikh Vefa and his disciples used to recite litanies out loud and perform audition. Chanting the litanies out loud is the method preferred by Khwafi. However performing audition is not. Khwafi asks from his disciple to sit down while they are performing litanies. According to him, disciples should sit in a dark room toward the direction of Mecca. They should bend their head forward and their hands should be on their knees.⁴¹⁶ Performing audition is an *ijtihad* made by Sheikh Vefa in his *tariqa*.

Sheikh Vefa used to prefer seclusion to companion. Prominent state figures used to visit him frequently. However, Sheikh Vefa used to prefer companion with the poor⁴¹⁷. At one occasion, Mehmed II came to meet him, but he refused. And once Bayezid II came to him with the same wish, but Sheikh Vefa refused him, too. Bayezid II attends Sheikh Vefa's funeral and asks to see his face. Scholars reject this wish since it is forbidden according to sharia. But Bayezid II insists and sees his face.⁴¹⁸ However, this does not mean that Sheikh Vefa has never met with them. Lami Çelebi says for

swaying movement, around, into and out of the circle. Occasionally an individual participant will step into the middle of the circle. It may be that, for example, a member of the Mawlawiya attends an audition of, say, the Halveti-Jerrahi order and performs his whirling in the middle while the members of the host group form concentric circles around him. Simpler forms may involve little more than rhythmic tilting back and forth, or from side to side, while chanting a *dhikr* text or syllable. Sacred movement has been an important medium in which Sufis have sought to involve themselves more fully in the experience of prayer, and it has in some cases been employed explicitly as a means to altered consciousness or ecstasy. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 68.

⁴¹⁵ Erdemir, “Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa,” 59-60.

⁴¹⁶ Köle, *Zeynüddin*, 182.

⁴¹⁷ Here the term of *faqir* is used. This word is also used by dervishes from the same *tariqa* to call each other. It is possible to understand this term with its both references.

⁴¹⁸ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 238.

Sheikh Vefa, this choice of seclusion was in his older ages.⁴¹⁹ When we examine Sheikh Vefa's relation with prominent figures in detailed, it will be possible to comprehend his approach to the issue of relations with the Sultans and other high bureaucrats.

Sheikh Vefa has seen many aids from Mehmed II. Mehmed II built for him a mosque and two hammams in the district that is called as Vefa afterward. Mehmed II, also, assigned the income of a village in Çorlu for Sheikh Vefa.⁴²⁰ This mosque is used as a lodge by the Zayni dervishes. Mehmed II also endowed the terrain near Sheikh Vefa's mosque. Sheikh Vefa built rooms for dervishes, a library and a kitchen on this terrain.⁴²¹

Sheikh Vefa is more distant with Bayezid II when compared with Mehmed II. When Bayezid II wanted to marry off his girl he wanted Sheikh Vefa to solemnize and sent forty thousand dirhams to him as present. Sheikh Vefa rejected this wish and said, "Sheikh Muhyiddin Kocavi (another Zayni, disciple of Piri Halife) is poor and a blessed man. Give this money to him." They took the money to Kocavi and Bayezid II's daughter is solemnized by him.⁴²² It seems like Bayezid II wanted to build a closer relation with Sheikh Vefa but Vefa did not tolerate this wish. The reason of Sheikh Vefa's attitude may have roots in his relation with Karamani Mehmed Paşa (d. 1481).

Relation between Sheikh Vefa and Mehmet II's Grand Vizier Karamani Mehmed Paşa is close. One incident is significant in that sense. Sheikh Vefa intends to perform hajj when he was in Konya. He goes to Antalya to embark a ship. Pirates hijack the ship. Sheikh Vefa and his sisters are captured as prisoners. Karamani İbrahim Bey buys and rescues them from pirates.⁴²³

⁴¹⁹ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 559.

⁴²⁰ İsmail E. Erünsal, "Şeyh Vefa ve Vakıfları Hakkında Yeni Bir Belge," *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1997): 61-62.

⁴²¹ Ibid., 56.

⁴²² Taşköprizade, *Shaqa'iq*, 239.

⁴²³ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 560; Vassaf, *Sefine-i Evliya*, 1:329.

Another incident that shows intimacy of Sheikh Vefa with Mehmed Paşa is more significant. And this incident gives an interesting explanation of murder of Karamani Mehmed Paşa. In the fight for throne between Bayezid II and Cem Sultan, Karamani Mehmed Paşa stands for Cem Sultan. When Bayezid II was governor in Amasya, he hears Karamani Mehmet Paşa inculcates to Mehmet II against Bayezid II in Istanbul. He asks for the spiritual help of Halveti Sheikh Çelebi Halife (d. 1494) for pushing Karamani Mehmed Paşa out. Sheikh Çelebi Halife tries to do that with his disciples with a spiritual ritual. Sheikh Çelebi Halife says Bayezid II that, “Karamani Mehmed Paşa is protected by the *wafq* written by Shayk Vefa. It is a hard work to break this protection. However, I and my disciples will manage to break it in a short time.” Indeed, Mehmed II dies instantly and Janissaries kill the Grand Vizier. In the sources, the incident of murder is told as follows, “Because the death of Mehmed II, Karamani Mehmed Paşa bustles and a part of the *wafq*, that at the forehead of Karamani gets wet from the sweat and is erased partly. Karamani Mehmed Paşa sends the *wafq* to Sheikh Vefa for him to rewrite. However, he is killed before Sheikh Vefa sends him back the *wafq*.”⁴²⁴ The epitaph on the tombstone of Karamani Mehmed Paşa is written by Sheikh Vefa.⁴²⁵

As we see there is a difference in Sheikh Vefa’s attitude toward Mehmed II and Bayezid II. His relation with Mehmed II is in the style that Khwafi advised to his disciples and performed toward Shahrukh, as we termed in the related chapter as “a balanced relation, not too close against the danger of losing his religious authority and not too distant against to lose his function as an educator.” Sheikh Vefa was pursuing his activities in a mosque endowed and built by the Sultan, Mehmed II. There was no problem in this since Khwafi permitted his disciple to pursue activity in a lodge patronized by the Sultan.

This balanced relation seems collapsed between Sheikh Vefa and Bayezid II. In spite of the efforts of Bayezid II, Sheikh Vefa was not allowing him to get intimate. The

⁴²⁴ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 580; Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 142.

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*, 140.

reason of this is probably that Sheikh Vefa believed his protector, since his time in Karaman, Karamani Mehmed Paşa was killed because of Bayezid II.

Sheikh Vefa, especially in his senescent period, lives a secluded life. It is told that, “At a spring day, his disciples invites him out for him to see the beauties God created. He answers as, ‘Let me eat one bite more tonight. So, I can find the energy to be able to go out tomorrow.’”⁴²⁶ His secluded life ends in 9 July 1491. He is buried in the tomb located in front of his mosque. Sultan Bayezid II attends his funeral.

5. 6. 1. An Akbari Zayni Sheikh in Istanbul: Sheikh Vefa and Ibn ‘Arabi

Sheikh Vefa came to Istanbul after the conquest and lived there for the rest of his life. He was a Zayni sheikh though made important changes in the practice and doctrine of the order. Perhaps, that is why the order of Vefa is called as Wafaiyya-i Zayniyya after him.⁴²⁷ In other words, Sheikh Vefa’s tariqa is appeared as a new branch of the Zayniya Sufi order.

In the practice, the most significant change Sheikh Vefa did is that he ordered the performance of audition (*sama*) in the gatherings. İnançer says, Zayniyya order follows the Khorasan Sufi School; therefore they perform audition in their gatherings.⁴²⁸ However, there are no records that say Khwafi or Qudsi ordered the performance of audition. İnançer says, “Zayni litanies ritual has many similarities with the Halwati ritual. Sheikh Vefa made a new *ijthad* in his order and formed what is called as *Vefa Devri*⁴²⁹ and *Wafaiyya Awrad* to be performed in these gatherings. Sheikh Vefa also composed the *awrad* and made them musical pieces.”⁴³⁰ Performing audition during the gatherings continued till the order loses its power in Istanbul.⁴³¹

⁴²⁶ Taşköprizade, *Shaqa’iq*, 239.

⁴²⁷ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 130.

⁴²⁸ İnançer, Ömer Tuğrul. *Zeynîlik (Zikir Usulü ve Musiki)*. Vol. 7, DBİA. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 553.

⁴²⁹ A special ritual performed during *dhikr*. Each dervich holds hand of his order mate’s hand, making half steps while chanting certain names of Allah. They are *Allah, Vahid, Ahad, Samed*. For further information see the article of “Cerrahîlik” in DBİA.

⁴³⁰ İnançer, *Zeynîlik*, 553.

⁴³¹ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 158-159.

The prominent change Vefa made in the order's doctrine manifests itself clearly in his *Saz-i 'Irfan*. As mentioned above, the book gives an Akbarian stance for the creation of universe and order in the cosmos. This Akbarian stance is shown in his *Makam-i Suluk* either. We will first examine the *Saz-i 'Irfan* then *Makam-i Suluk*.

Saz-i 'Irfan comprises of eight chapters. Four chapters consist of couplets and four chapters consist of quatrains. This is one of the poetry books of Sheikh Vefa. He starts first chapter with verses mention the unity of God. After that, comes the invocation part. Then, he directly enters to the difficult subjects of Sufism. He mentions cosmology, creation of universe, attributes and names of God, secrets of divine love, realms, and Prophet Muhammad. In the book, Sheikh Vefa tries to give a big picture of the all universe from beginning of the creation. The significant feature of this book is that this picture is an Akbarian picture. This feature will be explained deeply.

Bursalı Mehmed Tahir and Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı suggested the book belongs to a poet named Bahrî because of a repetitive quatrain passes in the book. The name of Bahrî stands in the last verse of the quatrain. However, Erdemir, who wrote a PhD dissertation on Sheikh Vefa, proves the book belongs to Sheikh Vefa. According to him, Bahrî is a notion of Sufi terminology and refers to the terms like pole (*ghawth*)⁴³² and perfect sheikh (*murshid al-kamil*) in the verse.⁴³³

Makam-ı Suluk is another poetry book of Sheikh Vefa. In this book, he explains stations that the seeker should experience throughout his spiritual journey. According to Vefa there are seven stations. First station is the *sayr ilallah*. This is the station of soul self (*nafs*). In this station, soul self tortures the soul. People who are

⁴³² Pinnacle of the Sufi cosmological hierarchy. Individual Sufi leaders have sometimes been identified as the cosmic axis, pivot, or pole (*quṭb*) "of the age," suggesting that the cosmic hierarchy is subject to metaphorical renewal in that it is composed of living individuals. In that sense the term refers to the highest level of sanctity among Friends of God. Some consider the pole of each age to be the manifestation of the spirit of the Prophet for that time, and in certain orders the sheikh is regarded as the pole. The word "pole" is preferable to "axis" in this context, because the former preserves the tent metaphor carried on in the term *awṭad* ("tent pegs") discussed in the entry supports. The term *ghawth*, Arabic for "assistance," is often used as virtually synonymous with *quṭb*, but some theorists rank *ghawth* second to the pole. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 185.

⁴³³ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 70.

in this station are inattentive and they proceed with committing sin. They love the world and forget the hereafter. They follow the orders of their soul self (*nafs*). They are not sincere in their faith. According to Sheikh Vefa, the seeker who is in this station should do following deeds, invocation, starting initiation with a Sheikh, repentance, and eating less.⁴³⁴ Second station is the *sayr lillah*. The seeker in this station follows the orders of God and is always conscious of servitude. Their invocation is silent. The seeker in this station is among the people of divine love. There are so many difficulties for them. Soul self still has many faults. The state of the seeker changes constantly. Only the ones who have patience can achieve their goals. Most of them deviate in this station. Satan and soul self pull many tricks against the seeker. That is why seeker in this station should be very careful about the sharia. They should always remember God and they should have the fear from God in their hearts all the time.⁴³⁵ Third station is the *sayr 'alallah*. The most significant feature of the seeker in this station is that divine love posses the seeker completely. The seeker in this station becomes loyal to his beloved one, i.e. God. This station overcomes some and takes their reason away and some in this station perish. Divine love destroys and melts the seeker. Many kinds of secrets arrive to the hearts of the seeker in this station. God manifests His deeds and attributes.⁴³⁶ Forth station is the *sayr ma'allah*. According to Sheikh Vefa, qualifications of the seeker in this station are as follows. Seeker starts to understand divine secrets. Sometimes he loses himself and sometimes he speaks mystical words. He burns from inside and outside and continuously shed tears. He thinks himself as friend of God and perfect human. He is ashamed of his amazement and repents. He wishes the help of God for not being among the deceived. His soul self keeps on pulling tricks. Many starts to fight with his soul self. This fight led seeker to worldly pleasures. That is why, seeker should know that there is no limit for tricks of soul self and always ask help of God. Seeker should save himself from the brutish elements. Then, he can enter among the people of mystical knowledge (*'irfān*) and separation transforms to union. Only then, soul self pacifies.⁴³⁷ Fifth station is the *sayr fillah*. According to Sheikh Vefa, seeker who

⁴³⁴ Ibid., 89-91.

⁴³⁵ Ibid., 91.

⁴³⁶ Ibid., 92.

⁴³⁷ Ibid., 92-93.

reaches this station knows what to do and where to go. He sees all cosmos as his beloved. He gazes at divine entifications (*ta'ayyunat*). For the seeker, there is nothing but God in this station and state of annihilation in God (*fana fi al-wujud*⁴³⁸) eventuates.⁴³⁹ Sixth station is the *sayr 'anillah*. In this station seeker remembers the entification and shed tears all the time. He thinks about the day of meeting with God and cannot sleep at nights. He astonishes and cannot compose himself. He speaks erudite words. This is the station of science of things. Prophet Adam learned the name of things in this station. This station is also called as the station of prophecy. Quality of servitude becomes perfect here. Perfect worship can be performed here. People in this station are the foes of soul self and friends of God. They bring light to people, which they acquired from God.⁴⁴⁰ Seventh station is the *sayr billah*. This is the final point of sainthood. Prophet Muhammad is sheikh of everyone in this station. Here, soul self and person are perfect. After this station, there is only God. Everything is ephemeral except God and God is the only perpetual. In this station, there is no past, future, this, or that. Everything is one and there is no number. It is infidelity commentate about this station in these pages. After all, seeker in this station is ingenuous.⁴⁴¹

Sheikh Vefa, in his *Saz-i 'Irfan* follows Ibn 'Arabi, Qunawi, and Ibn Farid, word by word when he is explaining the creation of universe and the levels of existence (*maratib al-wujud*). *Saz-i 'Irfan* is a large book, consists of 372 couplets and 145 quatrains. It is impossible to examine *Saz-i 'Irfan* in full. Therefore, only couplets directly related with Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of levels of existence will be examined in this work. We will take only English translations of the couplets. However, when it is necessary I will also give their original pronunciation between parantheses. Numbers of couplets and quatrains will be given above the line of translated parts.

⁴³⁸ Generally paired with abiding, annihilation (*fana*) or "passing away" refers to a fundamental aspect of spiritual experience. Sufis have interpreted the experience in various ways. At one end of the spectrum, the individual is said to lose all traces of individual personality. If God is the only reality, and nothing else possesses authentic existence, the full realization of this ultimate truth constitutes "loss" of self in the One. For this, see Renard, *Sufism*, 33.

⁴³⁹ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 93.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid., 94.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid.

Saz-i 'Irfan starts with parts of invocation, eulogy of Prophet Muhammad, gratitude, glorify, and prayer. During the glorify parts Sheikh Vefa mentions the state of human beings God created. In this part, a couplet is interesting since it gives an indirect stance resembles the approach of Ibn 'Arabi on the spiritual journey. Sheikh Vefa says,

[58]

Their journey is in, from, for,
And at You, They find welfare when they stand with You⁴⁴²

According to Ibn 'Arabi, each created thing journeys through God even if that thing wants or not. This is valid for human beings either, does not matter which religion they believe in. As the reason of this compulsive journey through God, Ibn 'Arabi says, everything returns to its essence. Ibn 'Arabi clarifies people who carry out this journey with respect to three categories. They are; first, the ones who journey away from God, the ones who journey to God, and lastly, the ones who journey at God. All human beings, does not matter their belief or unbelief, are in one of these categories. Sheikh Vefa, in his couplet approaches to the state of human beings with Ibn 'Arabi's perspective.

Sheikh Vefa, after the part of eulogy and glorify parts, starts mentioning the levels of existence. In accordance with the members of Akbari School, Sheikh Vefa starts the subject from the level of nonentification (*La Ta'ayyun*). He says,

[87]

Know that, the Necessary Being (*Wajib al-Wujud*) was present primarily
There was nothing else to company

[89]

Under the mastery of his name of Hidden (*batin*), everything was inundated

⁴⁴² Ibid., 220.

They became known with the divine light of His name of Apparent (*zahir*)

[90]

I mean, His *wujud* is apart from no one
His essence stands, absence did not touch it

[91]

He is the One, separation is impossible for His essence
His unity exterminated each drop of entification⁴⁴³

The time Sheikh Vefa called “primarily”, is the level of nonentification as Ibn ‘Arabi called it. The necessary being as Sheikh Vefa called it in this poem, showed no entification yet and there was nothing else beside Him. As we mentioned in Chapter 4, there is no entification during the state of nonentification. Sheikh Vefa, in this sense, says, what annihilates any sort of entification is his unity. According to Ibn ‘Arabi, there is no dividedness in this period. What vanishes the divisions is His oneness. Sheikh Vefa, in this sense, says,

[92]

Entity was only belong to Him, others had no strength
He [God] vanished the dividedness with His oneness.⁴⁴⁴

Then Sheikh Vefa mentions four great names of God and relation of His decree with these names. He says,

[95]

To His specific decree, and to Him, every existent
Returns, Contemplate this delicacy!

[96]

⁴⁴³ Ibid., 222-23.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid., 223.

He is Prior (*awwal*), and He is Apparent, Hidden, and the Latest (*akhir*)
Abandon the polytheism, if you know this you would find the peace.⁴⁴⁵

God's names of *awwal*, *akhir*, *zahir*, and *batin* are the names that each creed on earth has emanated from, according to Ibn 'Arabi. The level of Souls, and things and other realms that are equal to these two levels are manifested from the forms of these four names. That means, everything we saw and experienced today, in this world, are built upon these names. Ibn 'Arabi even says, God built a home for Himself, on these four names, since He is Prior, Latest, Hidden, and Apparent.⁴⁴⁶ It seems these four names have the same value for Sheikh Vefa either. As we see, not knowing God with these four names is blasphemy according to him, just as knowing God with attributes only peculiar to Him (*salbi*) is blasphemy according to Ibn 'Arabi. And in the 95th couplet Sheikh Vefa says everything will return to Him as Ibn 'Arabi told, everything returns to its essence. The names of Prior, Latest, Hidden, and Apparent have great significance in Ibn Arabi's thought. And it seems same names are equally significant for Sheikh Vefa either.

After that, Sheikh Vefa starts mentioning the immutable entities (*'ayan-i thabita*). He says,

[98]

Immutable entities are with the most holy effusion (*fiyd-i aqdas*)
Its stability is the ability of everyone⁴⁴⁷

As we mentioned in Chapter 4, immutable entities are the constant, stable, and rational forms that everything appeared in the realm of imaginative similitudes are reflections of them. And, according to Ibn 'Arabi, God continually manifests Himself in the forms of immutable entities with His merciful breath. And his theophany in the forms of immutable entities is called the most holy effusion. As we see above, Sheikh

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁶ Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 109-10.

⁴⁴⁷ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 223.

Vefa agrees with Ibn 'Arabi in this sense. Also, Sheikh Vefa mentions immutable entities right after God's four names for a reason. According to Ibn 'Arabi, these four names are actually merciful breath of God and everything on earth created from these names and in this creation immutable entities, as the rational forms, have great influence since everything on earth are reflections of them. Sheikh Vefa seems aware of this connection.

Moreover, according to Ibn 'Arabi, God has no name, attribute, and deed that are apprehensible since there is no consciousness to apprehend. The first move from the level of nonentification to the level of first entification starts with God's Love. God's Love is the reason of His first move.⁴⁴⁸ This love is the love of coming to be known according to Sheikh Vefa. In this sense, he says,

[99]

God was hidden and loved to be known

With His names, attributes, and effects of His deeds⁴⁴⁹

This couplet signifies that Sheikh Vefa is going to start explanation of the level of first entification. Now, as we mentioned in Chapter 4, Ibn 'Arabi also calls this state, the reality of Muhammad and gives as evidence the hadith that says, "I was a Prophet when Prophet Adam was between water and mud." In accordance with that, Sheikh Vefa says,

[101]

First He created His beloved one, and praise to God,

Favored us by adding among his umma⁴⁵⁰

Then, Sheikh Vefa mentions the second feature of the first entification. He says,

⁴⁴⁸ Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 97.

⁴⁴⁹ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 223.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid., 224.

[103]

Level of oneness is illuminated since it is the first one
The second is, know that, the realm of unity

[104]

The name of Allah united the separated names
Unity appeared with it, understand this divine secret⁴⁵¹

As we mentioned in Chapter 4, Ibn 'Arabi says, there is no separation and multiplicity in this realm. Qunawi asserts that, rank of first levels are as follows; the Unknown; Oneness (*ahadiyat*); and Unity (*wahdaniyya*).⁴⁵² Sheikh Vefa gives the exact same rank. First he mentions the level of nonentification, and then, he says, comes the oneness and then comes the unity.

Then comes a couplet that gives an Akbarian feature of the immutable entities. He says,

[120]

If what was stable in each of them [immutable entities] before
He [God] made it their destiny⁴⁵³

In this sense, as mentioned in Chapter 4, Ibn 'Arabi says, whatever you are associated with while you are at the state of immutable entities, it is the thing that appears on your existence. That means, if someone is Muslim during the state of immutable entities, he is a Muslim in this world either. Sheikh Vefa, in the couplets, before and after the 120th one, explains the state of people on earth. Some of them are praised and some of them are cursed. The reason of their benevolence and malignancy arise from their state in the immutable entities. Sheikh Vefa verbalizes the features of

⁴⁵¹ Ibid.

⁴⁵² Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences," 116.

⁴⁵³ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 226.

these good and bad people in detailed. So, it takes pages. Then, he finally gives the name of this level, First Entification, directly. He says,

[145]

The real place of pleasure for Gnostics became this curtain and
Essence's presence became with two entifications

[147]

First entification is that it is His theophany
In Himself, as Himself, for Himself, listen to this delicacy⁴⁵⁴

As we told, there are no separation and multiplicity in this realm. In this, realm Entity knows the names and attributes in Himself and as Himself. And since cognizant, recognized, and cognizance are one and the same thing, this recognition is for Himself. This is the state of oneness. This is an Akbarian stance as we mentioned above. Sheikh Vefa, in this couplet, clearly adopts it.

Sheikh Vefa mentions the absence of separation and multiplicity in another series of couplets as follows,

[161]

In this realm, difference is impossible
It was an absolute agglomerate and removed the difference

[162]

Until the oneness and unity became one and the same thing
And separation and unity intermingled

Then Sheikh Vefa mentions the level of second entification directly. According to him, the feature of this entification is the manifestation of separation on the external entity. He says,

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid., 228.

[163]

The difference is in the second entification, know that

[In this realm there is] unity between apparent entity and the science of
seperation⁴⁵⁵

In these couplets, Sheikh Vefa gives the place of oneness as the first entification and the place of unity as the second entificaion. The one who does that clearly is Qunawi and Farghani.⁴⁵⁶

Then Sheikh Vefa mentions again about the immutable entities since where they really disclosed themselves is here, the level of second entification. He says,

[166]

Immutable entities is that possibility is its descendant

And it became the structure of separation of the truth

[167]

Yet, know! What is aggregator and isthmus for everything

Perfection is the ornament of truth of human

[168]

Know the isthmus of unity and oneness

I found the precedence of the reality of Ahmad⁴⁵⁷

⁴⁵⁵ Ibid., 230.

⁴⁵⁶ Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences," 117.

⁴⁵⁷ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 230.

According to Ibn 'Arabi, in the level of second entification, rational forms entify. They are still not the external existents but their structural and effective forms are. And these forms, also called as immutable entities, are essences of possible things. Their transformation in the realm of witnessing happens with God's order of "*kun*" as mentioned in Chapter 4. Sheikh Vefa, in the 166th couplet, says that immutable entities are the previous forms of the possible things and they are the structure, hence the reason of the separation in accordance with Ibn 'Arabi. Then Sheikh Vefa returns to explain the level of first entification again. In the 167th couplet, he mentions the perfection of human being and in the 168th couplet, he orders us to know the isthmus (*barzakh*) between unity and oneness. This is a direct reference to the Akbarian terminology since the perfect human and the isthmus between unity and oneness are the other names of the level of first entification. Moreover, in the level of first entification, Sheikh Vefa says, he found the reality of Ahmad. Here "Ahmad" refers to Prophet Muhammad since it is His other name. As mentioned in the related chapter, other name of the level of first entification is the reality of Muhammad.

Then, Sheikh Vefa makes a metaphor. In this metaphor, he likens the breath of human to the breath of God. He says,

[171]

The breath of human is the instance of it [breath of God] that it makes
All letters apparent with its [breath of human] course and diffusion

[172]

This breath is previously hidden in the hearth with the unity
Then its name became breath that its influence affected the skin

[173]

Forms, with a fluent breath, became intangible
It journeys on the skin that skin is its property

[174]

Because it is zealous and resolves to move out

It emanated and its name became breath and found manifestation

[175]

This emanation is the principal of all letters

Its attainment to the outlet⁴⁵⁸ is in 28 different voices

[176]

They are 28 since the letter of *La* is repeated

All of these letters are the result of human breath⁴⁵⁹

As we mentioned, the merciful breath of God (*nafas al-rahmani*) is the other name of the realm of second entification. Perhaps the most significant feature of this level is that immutable entities are located here as the substances of visible possible things. In this sense, breath of human is the substance of the pronounced letters. According to Sheikh Vefa, the creation of universe and the creation of words follow similar patterns. The breath of human is firstly hidden in the hearth of human and this is a state of unity just like the Entity was hidden in the nonentification. The breath wants to go out just like God loves to be known. This wish is the reason of the first motion. Emanation of breath is the principal of letters just like the immutable entities are the substance of all visible things. Same metaphor is drawn by Qunawi either. He says, "The page and the writing on it, [human] breath and sound, these are similar to theophany of divine light of Entity by the merciful breath of God. ... To write and to say are similar to create and to manifest."⁴⁶⁰

This metaphor also has a significant place in the Akbarian literature. According to Ibn Arabi, hearth is the mediator faculty that transforms primordial sound into

⁴⁵⁸ As an organ or place of utterance of a letter of the alphabet.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid., 231.

⁴⁶⁰ Sadreddin Konevî, *Miftâhu'l-Gayb*, ed. Ekrem Demirli (İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2014), 89^a.

articulated language. In this transformation, the 28 letters in the Arabic alphabet play the main role since they “represent in fact the microcosmic and human expression of the essential determinations of the Divine Breath.”⁴⁶¹

However, Sheikh Vefa warns people against the danger of seeing breath of God and human as the same things. He says,

[178]

However do not be an infidel by thinking that they are same

Oh seeker! God has no partner, equal, nor antipole⁴⁶²

Sheikh Vefa’a approach to the letters is interesting. First he attributes divinity to the letters by likening the breath of human to the breath of God. When he is doing so, he builds the same metaphor made by Sadr al-Din Qunawi. Then, in the oncoming pages he changes the type organization of verses and starts to write in the forms of quatrains. In the 179th couplet he says,

[179]

Listen to those quatrains built upon the rhyme of letters

We indicate our intention with these letters⁴⁶³

In these quatrains, Sheikh Vefa rhymes with respect to the row of letters in the alphabet. For example, in the first quatrain, first verse starts with the letter of *hamza* and each verse ends with hamza again and first verse of the second quatrain starts with the letter of *alif* and each verse ends with *alif*, etc. There are four chapters of quatrains in *Saz-i ‘Irfan* and Sheikh Vefa adopts this pattern in each of them.

In the following pages Sheikh Vefa expresses a more clear statement of connection with the science of letters. In the 31st and 33rd couplets of the forth couplet chapter he says,

⁴⁶¹ Titus Burckhardt, *Mystical Astrology According to Ibn ‘Arabi* (Louisville, KY: Fons Vitae, 2001), 35.

⁴⁶² Erdemir, “Muslihu’d-Din Mustafa,” 231.

⁴⁶³ Ibid.

[31]

It ended and He [God] created the heaven of *thawabit*⁴⁶⁴

They are structured in 28 stages

[32]

They are divided into 1000 and 21 stages

Each of them is the stage of an angel

[33]

28 letters came from these [28] stages

And they all occurred from a clean outlet.⁴⁶⁵

These couplets are a clear sign of Sheikh Vefa's intimacy with Akbari School and science of letters. According to Ibn 'Arabi, letters are composed of these heavens. For example there are letters whose stages include the seven heavens such as *alif*, *za*, and *lam*; and there are letters whose stages include nine heavens. Ibn 'Arabi says, letters are created from these heavens and there is a significant interrelation between letters and heavens.⁴⁶⁶ Sheikh Vefa adopts this approach and does not hesitate from using it in his *Saz-i 'Irfan*.

In the first chapter of quatrains, Sheikh Vefa makes a significant reference to Sadr al-Din Qunawi. He says,

[18]

Ask this secret to sheikh to find the salvation

By escaping from the ignorance and suspicion

*Miftah-i Ghayb*⁴⁶⁷ is in your hand it opens that hearth

⁴⁶⁴ *Thawabit* is the eighth heaven according to cosmological system of Ptolemy. This system is widely used by the Muslim scholars. This heaven is the heaven of constant stars and horoscopes. This heaven is also called as *kursi*. For this, see Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 133-34.

⁴⁶⁵ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 272-73.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibn Arabi, *Harflerin İlmî*, 68,69.

⁴⁶⁷ Lexical meaning of the term is "key of the mystery." However, *Miftah al-Ghayb* is a very famous book of Sadr al-Din Qunawi. Book's complete name is *Miftah al-Ghayb al-Jam' wa al-Wujud fî al-Kashf wa al-Shuhud*. Please see the article of "Miftâhu'l-Gayb" in DîA for further information.

The key blank is empty and it pertains to love⁴⁶⁸

The term of *Miftah-ı Ghayb* refers here to both of lexical meaning and the famous book of Sadr al-Din Qunawi. When we consider term's lexical meaning the meaning of the verse does not damages the context. According to lexical meaning, the key of the mystery is in the hand of the seeker and it is divine love. According to second meaning, the book of Qunawi, *Miftah-ı Ghayb*, is in the hand of the seeker and the seeker, by learning from that book, escapes from ignorance and suspicion and gains the divine love. In this context, the sheikh who has been asked is Qunawi. Sheikh Vefa, as a poet who frequently uses a symbolic dialect, placed the term in a way that it refers to these two meanings. However, the real intention of Sheikh Vefa is most probably to the book of Qunawi, since *Miftah-ı Ghayb* is a book written to explain what is explained in Sheikh Vefa's *Saz-i 'Irfan*. The main topic of *Miftah-ı Ghayb* seems like the perfect man. However this issue is directly related with the realms of Entity and Qunawi gives a great significance to the issue of levels of existence as Sheikh Vefa did.

In the beginning of the second chapter of the couplets, Sheikh Vefa makes another direct reference. This time he refers to *al-Ta'iyya* of Ibn Farid. He says,

[1]

Listen to these nice words with *Ta'iyya*

This time in the second stage and it is pretty for sure⁴⁶⁹

The term *Ta'iyya* refers to Ibn Farid's *Qasida al-Ta'iyya*. As we mentioned above, Qunawi greatly respects Ibn Farid and many first generation members of Akbari School writes commentaries on *al-Ta'iyya*. With the efforts of Qunawi and Farghani, Ibn Farid's *al-Ta'iyya* becomes an inseperable part of Akbari teaching. In this book, Ibn Farid also gives references to levels of existence. His assertions are in harmony with members of Akbari School.

⁴⁶⁸ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 236.

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid., 241.

Right after his reference to *al-Ta'yya*, Sheikh Vefa directly gives the name of the forth realm in Akbarian cosmology. He says,

[4]

This realm is the second one of five realms

And the level of souls is the beginning of existence.⁴⁷⁰

As mentioned in the related chapter, in the Akbarian cosmology, immutable entities take one step down and transforms into abstract-elementary existent. They, still, are not matters since they are not material and composition. Yet, this is the first step of the existence. Sheikh Vefa in these couplets gives a great clue about the taxonomy he followed. He calls the level of souls as the second of five realms. As we mentioned in the Chapter 4, Qunawi, in his taxonomy of five divine presences (*Hazarat al-Khams*) calls the second level as the level of souls. In this manner his approach is more close to Qunawi than Farghani since Farghani follows a taxonomy with six categories.⁴⁷¹

Then, Sheikh Vefa mentions the forth level of Qunawi's taxonomy. When he is doing so he also gives the name of fifth level, the realm of witnessing. He says,

[29]

Some goes to that side and reaches to the realm of souls

And some goes to this side and reaches to the realm of witnessing.

[30]

The realm of imaginative similitudes stands between them

It becomes an isthmus for the souls and bodies.⁴⁷²

As indicated in the related chapter, subsequent realms after the realm of second entitification are as followed respectively, the realm of souls, the realm of

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., 241.

⁴⁷¹ Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences," 117.

⁴⁷² Ibid., 257.

imaginative similitudes, and the realm of witnessing. Sheikh Vefa gives their name by following this row. He also mentions the place of the realm of imaginative similitudes as an isthmus between the upper and lower levels. This also suits with the Akbarian approach. As we mentioned, Ibn Arabi terms this realm as an isthmus. Moreover, Sheikh Vefa, in the 37th and 38th couplets, gives other names of the realm of imaginative similitudes as *mithāl-i muqayyad*, *‘ālam-i khayāl-i muttaṣil*, *‘ālam-i khayāl-i munfaṣil*.⁴⁷³ This is again the term Ibn ‘Arabi gave to this realm.

After this part, Sheikh Vefa explains the creation of the universe. He mentions creation of the planet earth and elements that earth is composed from. He also mentions the planets, zodiacal constellation and their interrelations. He also mentions the angels and prophets who are in charge of the order of the universe. In short, he explains the world we live in at the present. He gives the name of the realm of humanity in the 72nd couplet. He says,

[72]

The fruit of the tree of Entity is humanity, it springed up
By completing the perfect cycle.⁴⁷⁴

In *Saz-i ‘Irfan*, Sheikh Vefa’s approval of Akbari School is not limited with only the doctrine of levels of existence. He adopts an Ibn ‘Arabi’s stance in his approach of cosmological system either.

In the 5th and 7th couplets of the last chapter of couplets Sheikh Vefa says,

[5]

⁴⁷³ Ibid., 258.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid., 277.

Firstly He created the '*arsh*⁴⁷⁵ then He performed *istiwa*⁴⁷⁶
He is *rahman* and He has competence for this performance

[7]

'*Arsh* encircles the forms and it is on the water

Every living thing that contains softness (*latafat*) occurred from there.⁴⁷⁷

In the Akbari terminology, besides being a heaven, '*arsh* is also a realm of *wujud*. '*arsh*, in the taxonomy with seven levels of Ibn 'Arabi, is the fifth realm, the realm of imaginative similitudes. As explained, this realm is an isthmus between the forth and sixth realms. Existents in this realm are more solid when compared with the upper level and softer when compared with the sixth realm. Sheikh Vefa, in accordance with this approach, says everything that holds softness in their system, occurs from there. This emergence happens by transforming into composite substances in Akbarian terminology. Moreover, according to Ibn 'Arabi, the performance of God's *istiwa* on '*arsh* happens by the name of *rahman*. Also, according to Sadr al-din Qunawi, the throne and the each layer of seven heavens are the places of *istiwa* for different names of God. God's mercy settles in the '*arsh* and everything returns to this mercy eventually. That is why *istiwa* cannot be attached with any other name but *rahman*.⁴⁷⁸ As we see in the second verse of the fifth couplet, Sheikh Vefa adopts this approach. Moreover, Sheikh Vefa also adopts Ibn 'Arabi's approach that suggests '*arsh* encircles the forms. In the Akbarian terminology, '*arsh* is in the shape of a square. Inside of '*arsh* is in the shape of a hole and it is very large. Everything is in this hole, such as heavens, paradises, sky, etc. '*arsh* is the first existence that accepts the form of matter, and in this way it also includes every forms within.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁵ This is the greatest heaven and the upmost section of the universe. For this, see Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 44-45.

⁴⁷⁶ The lexical meaning of the term is equipollence, intention, possession, covering, and residing. However, the term is frequently used in the sufi terminology as manifesting and appearing in a place, mostly on '*arsh*. However, here '*arsh* is also a metaphor and used to refer to the hearth of people. There are two types of *istiwā*. First is the *rahmānī istiwa* and the second is the *ilahī istiwa*. First happens in the hearts and second happens on the '*arsh*. For this, see Uludağ, *Tasavvuf Terimleri*, 195.

⁴⁷⁷ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 270.

⁴⁷⁸ Veysel Akkaya, "Muhyiddin İbnü'l-Arabî'de Arş Tasavvuru ve İstivâ Meselesi," *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2015): 388-89.

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid., 385-86.

Another significant issue in *Saz-i 'Irfan* is about the angels who are carrying 'arsh. Ibn 'Arabi mentions the same issue and says 'arsh is carried by four angels in this world and eight angels in the hereafter. Four angels who are carrying 'arsh in this world are in the forms of the angels of Gabriel, Michael, Raphael, and Ridwan⁴⁸⁰. And four angels who will participate in this job in the hereafter are going to be in the forms of following angel and prophets; Malik⁴⁸¹, Prophet Adam, Prophet Abraham, and Prophet Muhammad.⁴⁸²

Sheikh Vefa, in accordance with this suggestion, says,

[10]

... they became four

They occupied these forms for carrying the 'arsh

[11]

One is in the form of Gabriel and other three are famous

They made the work of carrying with these forms

[12]

Some nobles said the forth is Ridwan and four [angels] more

Will join them in the Judgment Day

[13]

They will be in the forms of Adam, and Rahman Khalili⁴⁸³ together with

⁴⁸⁰ The angel of Ridwan is the angel who watches paradise.

⁴⁸¹ The angel of Malik is the angel who watches hell.

⁴⁸² Ibid., 383.

⁴⁸³ Khalil al-Rahman is agnomen of Prophet Abraham.

As we see, Sheikh Vefa adopts Ibn 'Arabi's approach word by word in this issue. And, no doubt, names whom Sheikh Vefa referred as "some nobels" in the 12th couplet are Ibn Arabi and Sadr al-Din Qunawi.

The book of *Saz-i 'Irfan* reflects a clear Akbarian stance in the issues of cosmos, realms, heavens, and creation and structure of them. Sheikh Vefa never directly mentions the name of Ibn 'Arabi or other Akbari figures like Sadr al-Din Qunawi. However, he points them indirectly like in the arguments of "*Miftah-ı Ghayb*, some nobles, and *Ta'iyya*." He gives such a context that in the mind of the reader, who knows the Akbarian approach in these issues, appears the names of Ibn 'Arabi, Qunawi, and Ibn Farid instinctively. Another significant feature of the book is that Sheikh Vefa praises and uses the science of letter. He does not adopt the extreme doctrines of *Hurufiyya* but accepts it in a more moderate way as Ibn 'Arabi did.

There are also important points in Sheikh Vefa's *Makam-i Suluk* that show his intimacy with the Akbari School. However, it would be wrong to label Sheikh Vefa as an imitator of Ibn 'Arabi either in every issue. His contrast from Ibn 'Arabi manifests in the configuration of the book. We mentioned in the related chapter that the way Sheikh Vefa draw for the seeker has seven stations. However, in Ibn 'Arabi's spiritual journey there are four stages and these are *sayr ilallah*, *sayr fillah*, *sayr ma'allah*, and *sayr 'anillah*.⁴⁸⁶ In *Makām-ı Suluk* Sheikh Vefa uses the same system used by many Sufis for the spiritual journey of seeker. This is called *atwar-i sab'a*. This notion is actually a notion to refer to the stages of soul self (*nafs*). There are seven stages of soul self and they are *nafs-i ammara*, *nafs-i lawwama*, *nafs-i mulhima*, *nafs-i mutma'ina*, *nafs-i radiyya*, *nafs-i mardiyya*, and *nafs-i kamila*.⁴⁸⁷ The names of these station may alter in various books however, by a majority, the referred meaning of the station are very similar. This concept has a direct connection with the seeker's

⁴⁸⁴ Ahmad is the other name of Prophet Muhammed.

⁴⁸⁵ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 270-71.

⁴⁸⁶ Kılıç, *İbnü'l-Arabi*, 121-22.

⁴⁸⁷ See the article of "Nefis" in *DİA* for further information.

journey. Seeker overcomes the each station with specific tasks given him by his shakyl. Sheikh Vefa uses this notion and compiles his book under seven titles that each title refers one station of soul self.

In despite of this discrepancy, we find many references to Akbari School in *Makam-i Suluk*. For example, one of them occurs when Sheikh Vefa is mentioning the fifth station. He says,

[232]

Here, happens the *fana fi al-wujud*

Circumstances are ruined here they have no place to go

[233]

According to amount of the holy wine seeker drank

The state of *fana fi al-wujud* increases⁴⁸⁸

As we mentioned above, *fana fi al-wujud* means the annihilation in God. It should be wrong to suggest only Ibn 'Arabi used the term and the term refers to only doctrine of Akbari School. Throughout the Muslim history, many Sufis, no matter their spiritual order, used the term starting from very early ages such as Hallaj or Bayazid Bistami. They may not used the term with the same words but their approach usually reflects the idea behind the term and Sufis who use the term frequently refer them. Even so, Khwafi never uses the term. Together with the other evidences mentioned above, the usage of term by Sheikh Vefa shows that he was intimate with the doctrine of oneness of being. A more interesting and specific reference to the issue comes a couple of couplets later. Sheikh Vefa says,

[241]

He is prior, He is the latest, He is apparent

That His essence (*dhat*) manifests his own attributes

⁴⁸⁸ Erdemir, "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa," 310.

[243]

He is apparent, He is hidden, He is a sign

His sign is a sign for the signless

[244]

Because, the ones who believe in the unity saw that everything is Him

He is up, He is down, He is right and left⁴⁸⁹

We mentioned above the importance of God's four attributes of Prior, Latest, Apparent and Hidden. Everything beside God is created from these four attributes. Sheikh Vefa, in these couplets, says that everything beside God is actually nothing but God by saying that He is prior, latest, apparent and hidden. He also says the same thing in the 244th couplet, this time by mentioning the directions. Here, we should remember the dispute of *Heme ez ust/Heme ust* conducted by Khwafi and his Akbari disciple Sayyid Qasim. If we remember, Sheikh Baha' al-Din 'Umar asks about the news from city from Khwaja Ahrar. Khwaja Ahrar answers, "The followers of Zayn al-Din say 'everything is from him'. And the followers of Sayyid Qasim say, 'Everything is him'." We do not know if Sheikh Vefa was aware of this dispute. However, let's assume that, Sheikh Vefa was a Zayni disciple who lived approximately 70-80 years ago in Herat. He would most probably be in the same side with Sayyid Qasim and faced with the same reaction conducted by Khwafi.

Right after these couplets Sheikh Vefa again says significant couplets and this time he directs his argument against his own sheikh 'Abd al-Latif Qudsi. Sheikh Vefa says,

[247]

*"laysa fi masiwa allah"*⁴⁹⁰ he said

What Bayazid said in this is

[248]

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid., 311.

⁴⁹⁰ There is nothing except God.

There is nothing but God here there is nothing but God
There is no Kaaba here there is no cycle

[249]

And he, who is the sultan and pole of all wises
He is Bayazid and king of the all seekers, says

[250]

“All this time I speak with God
People suppose I speak with them”

[251]

This is the privilege of people of unity
They see God in each gaze⁴⁹¹

Here, we should remember what Qudsi said in this context, in his *Kashf al-I'tiqad*. As we mentioned in the related chapter, Qudsi mentions the quote of *laysa fi masiwa allah* when he was explaining the sect of *wujud*. He says this is the sect that defends the absolute unity (*wahda al-mutlaqa*). They say, “God was in the everything I saw”. Some of them say “with”, some say “before” and some say “after” in the place of “in” at the sentence. And some of them say, “I saw nothing but God.” Qudsi says the root of this sect is found in some Sufis and explains the issue in the context of doctrines of incarnation (*hulul*) and unification (*ittihad*). He says, there are two perspectives of these sayings, one is external and one is internal. If the one who says “there is nothing but God”, does not include God in the process of incarnation and unification and his intention is for the internal meaning, only then, the seeker is on the right path and he is in a very superior station which is called as the station of Prophet Muhammad.⁴⁹² In this context, Qudsi seems like justifies both Sheikh Vefa and Bistami. However, as we mentioned in the related chapter again, in another chapter of *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, Qudsi directly gives the names of Hallaj and Bistami by referring their problematic

⁴⁹¹ Ibid., 311-12.

⁴⁹² Qudsi, *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, 285-87.

words of “*ana al-haqq*” and “*subhani ma a’zama shani*”. Qudsi says, these are the words has been said during the state of ecstay. And according to Qudsi, even if these words are said by great Sufis like Bistami, they should not be accepted right since they are wrong with respect to sharia. Then, Qudsi harshens his words and suggests these statements actually imply the allegations of the sect of incarnationism. And finally Qudsi says, “We are distanced from them. We reject their statements as we rejected statements of Christians.”⁴⁹³

It is possible to assume that Sheikh Vefa refers to the internal meaning when he is citing the line of “*laysa fi masiwa allah.*” In this manner, he does not directly oppose his sheikh Qudsi’s approach to the issue. However, the couplet of “All this time I speak with God/People supposes I speak with them” shows the opposite. This is another problematic statement submitted by Bistami. Even the scribal of *Makam-i Suluk* writes near of the couplet “this statement is not accepted.”⁴⁹⁴ Also the line of “there is no Kabaa” is intriguing in this manner. Sheikh Vefa, in these lines, shows that he accepts these problematic statements. He opposes his sheikh’s statement of “we are distanced from them.” He accepts Bistami as the sultan and pole of all wises and king of the all seekers in his every words and what Qudsi labeled as the words said during the state of ecstasy are the truth according to Sheikh Vefa.

The most clear and direct indicator of Sheikh Vefa’s intimacy with Akbari School passes in *Nafahat* and *Shaqa’iq*. According to these records, one-day Sheikh Vefa is asked from Ibn Arabi’s statement of the faith of Pharaoh. They say, “Ibn ‘Arabi says Pharaoh is death as cleansed and clean, what do you say?” Sheikh Vefa’s answer is remarkable. He says, “I wish two muslims like Ibn ‘Arabi would testify for my faith, too.”⁴⁹⁵

Sheikh Vefa clearly agrees with Ibn Arabi’s statement about faith of Pharaoh. Sheikh Vefa’s answer gives a clear picture of the change eventuated in Zayni order since both Khwafi and Qudsi object Ibn Arabi’s approach. According to them, this statement is

⁴⁹³ Ibid., 284.

⁴⁹⁴ Erdemir, “Muslihu’d-Din Mustafa,” 312.

⁴⁹⁵ Lami Çelebi, *Nafahat*, 559; Taşköprizade, *Shaqa’iq*, 239.

wrong with respect to sharia. However, Sheikh Vefa does not agree with them and adopts Ibn Arabi's standpoint.

After the record about Ibn Arabi, in the aforementioned sources another remarkable answer of Sheikh Vefa passes, but this time it is about Hallaj Mansur. One day, they ask Sheikh Vefa, "What do you say about Mansur's statement of *ana al-haqq*?" Sheikh Vefa answers, "Do you expect him to say '*anā al-bāṭil*'?"⁴⁹⁶ Here, Sheikh Vefa gives a witty answer. The term of *haqq*'s lexical meaning is certainty, true, valid, and authentic. However it is also one of the 99 names of God. Hallaj used the term in the second meaning and that is why this statement became a contradictive issue. However, Sheikh Vefa uses term's lexical meaning in his answer and says "Do you expect him to say I am wrong?" By doing so, he does not involve in the debate. However, he definitely does not agree with fallacy of Hallaj. In fact, Sheikh Vefa agrees with Hallaj indirectly. As we mentioned above, Qudsi directly gives the quote of this line and Hallaj's name and says we are distanced from them. We reject their statements as we rejected statements of Christians. His disciple Sheikh Vefa does not agree with his sheikh.

5. 7. Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, we examined some Zayni disciples in Anatolia with respect to their ties with Akbari School. We mentioned five names, Şehabeddin Sivasi, Molla Fenari, Kutbüddinzade İzniki, Piri Halife Hamidi, and Sheikh Vefa.

Sivasi, in the literature, seen as a close figure to Ibn 'Arabi since his inclusion of Ibn 'Arabi's name to the chain of order he wrote for himself. However, when this chain is examined deeply, it shows that Sivasi probably united the chain of Qadiriyya and Zayniyya. This was most probably a mistake. Moreover, in his two book on Sufism, *Jazzab al-Qulub* and *Risala al-Najat*, we see no solid reference to Ibn 'Arabi or Khwafi

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid.

except the aforementioned chain. He addresses general audience not a specific community of tariqa. He also sees conversation more beneficial than seclusion. This is the opposite of Khwafi's advice. Under the light of these informations, it would not be wrong to assume that, for Sivasi, membership of Zayniyya did not have much of a value other than ensuring the legitimacy of Sivasi as a sheikh.

We mentioned Molla Fenari in two sections of this chapter. In the first section of this chapter, we examined his intimacy with Akbari School. Molla Fenari is a member of the textual and interpretative community built in Konya from Qunawi. His teacher Kayseri is the name that links him to this community. In the second section about Molla Fenari we discussed about Molla Fenari's intimacy with Zayniyya. Sources do not give a direct reference about Molla Fenari's intimacy with any of the tariqas of the age. However, he was most probably served Qudsi as his dervish. There are two evidences that make us think that way. First is the shape of his tombstone, which is peculiar to Zaynis. And the second is Molla Fenari's clear wish for being disciple of Qudsi in the poem Fenari wrote for Qudsi. Furthermore, in the previous chapter we mentioned that when Qudsi came to Bursa, he finds a group of Sufis that are waiting for him. This group was most probably a community that is found around Molla Fenari.

İzniki is an interesting figure. He is a part of the textual and interpretative community of Qunawi, i.e. Akbari School, like his teacher Molla Fenari. And again there is no direct reference for him about intimacy of a tariqa like Molla Fenari. However, he mentions about Khwafi with the epithet of our master and writes a commentary to Zayni litanies. These are solid evidences that shows his intimacy with Zayniyya. İzniki's novelty comes from his assertions about Pharaoh's faith and state of infidels in hell. As an Akbari, İzniki does not agree with Ibn 'Arabi in the issue of Pharaoh's faith. As for the state of infidels, he shows a close approach with Ibn 'Arabi however he explains the issue by referring to Imam Ghazzali and Tirmidhi.

Piri Halife Hamidi is disciple of Qudsi. He is a Zayni sheikh in Eğirdir. He also wrote a commentary to *Nusus* of Qunawi with the name of *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*. He asserts in the introduction of *Zubdat al-Tahqiq* that he was making courses of *Nusus* with his

disciples. Furthermore, in this book, he defended Ibn 'Arabi's position in the issue of comparison of sainthood with prophethood. So, we can count him as a member of Akbari School as well.

Sheikh Vefa is the outstanding figure of this chapter. He is a prominent disciple of Qudsi and Qudsi showed him great respect. After the death of Sheikh Vefa, his order is called as *Wafaiyya-i Zayniyya*. This means his order is understood as a new branch of Zayniya order. The reason of this new denomination is the *ijtihad*s made by Sheikh Vefa in both of practice and doctrine of the order.

The change he made in the practice of the order is the performance of *sama'* in the regular gatherings of dervishes. He also composed a new way of *sama'*, which is called as *Vefa Devri*, to be performed in these gatherings. Also as a significant change, disciples chanted the *awrad* written by Sheikh Vefa.⁴⁹⁷ Sheikh Vefa composed the hymns in this *awrad* for chanting them during *sama'*.

The most significant change Sheikh Vefa did in the doctrine of the order is the approval of Akbari doctrine. Furthermore, he opposed his sheikh Qudsi and Khwafi with respect to some symbolic issues.

Sheikh Vefa's *Saz-i 'Irfan* is a book that explains the creation of universe and the cosmological system by using Ibn Arabi's doctrine of levels of existence. Sheikh Vefa uses the categorization with the five divine presences. This classification is the widely accepted system of Akbari School, especially by Qunawi. Moreover, terminology of Sheikh Vefa complies with Akbarian terminology such as immutable entities, the most holy effusion, and the holy effusion, oneness, unity, first entification, second entification, etc. Qudsi uses a taxonomy of cosmological levels, either. However, this taxonomy with four levels are also used by Sufis before Ibn 'Arabi like Jilani. Furthermore, Qudsi never employs Akbari terminology.

⁴⁹⁷ Öngören, *Zeyniler*, 154.

Sheikh Vefa gives two direct references to two books produced by Akbari Sufis. First is *Miftah al-Ghayb* of Qunawi and the second is *al-Ta'yya* of Ibn Farid. His explanations of levels of existence fits the pattern that drawn by these two Akbari Sufis. Sheikh Vefa also makes another indirect reference with the term of "some nobles." Sheikh Vefa refers Ibn Arabi's approach with significant terms when explaining the cosmological system. The most explicit example is the angels who are in charge of carrying 'arsh here and hereafter. The forms of these angels are the forms disclosed by Ibn 'Arabi. During the explanation of these angels Sheikh Vefa refers a group called "some nobles." Content of this "some nobles" is sheikhs who are members of Akbari School inarguably and not Khwafi or Qudsi.

Another significant departure of Sheikh Vefa from Qudsi and Khwafi is his approach to the science of letters. For Khwafi, people who use science of letters are heretics. For Qudsi, the term of *Hurufiyya* gains a much broader meaning. Qudsi, in his *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, arrays all heretics he personally met under the title of *Hurufis*. In contrast, Sheikh Vefa praises science of letters with an Akbarian stance and uses it in his *Saz-i 'Irfan*.

Sheikh Vefa, in his *Makam-i Suluk*, expresses his opinion about a famous debate between Khwafi and Sayyid Qasim. In this debate, followers of Khwafi say *heme ez ust* while followers of Sayyid Qasim defend the opinion of *heme ust*. In this context, Sheikh Vefa advocates Sayid Qasim and says "everything is Him."

Qudsi, in his *Kashf al-I'tiqad*, attacks problematic expressions of Hallaj Mansur and Bayazid Bistami. According to Qudsi, these expressions are statements said during the state of ecstasy and cannot be approved since they are wrong with respect to sharia. Sheikh Vefa approves these names criticized by Qudsi. According to him, Bayazid is the sultan and pole of all wises and the king of all seekers and he is right in his other problematic statements of "*laysa fī masiwa allah*" and "*All this time I speak with God/People suppose I speak with them.*" Sheikh Vefa defends Hallaj in his statement of *ana al-haqq*. This is the statement Qudsi labeled as the similar of Christians fault. Sheikh Vefa uses a symbolic rhetoric in his defence and takes the

lexical meaning of the term of *haqq*. Consequently, he remarks Hallaj was right in his assertion.

Finally, Sheikh Vefa shows a significant breaking point about his stance in the issue of Pharaoh's faith. Khwafi and Qudsi agree with fault of Ibn Arabi in his statement of "Pharaoh died as a believer." As the answer of the question about rightfulness of Ibn 'Arabi on the issue, Sheikh Vefa wishes two Muslims like Ibn 'Arabi to testify his own faith.

In spite of these changes there are manners Sheikh Vefa preserved that are implemented by both Qudsi and Khwafi. Foremost among them comes the relation with the power. If compare Khwafi's relation with Shahrukh and Sheikh Vefa's relation with Mehmed II, we see that both of these sheikhs build an approximate relation with sultans. We defined the relation between Khwafi and Shahrukh as a balanced relation, not too close against the danger of losing his religious authority and not too distant against to lose his function as an educator." We showed that Sheikh Vefa adopts the same manner in his relation with Mehmed II. Both of these sheikhs do not involve the affairs of state directly and do not get intimate with sultans. However, both of them have middlemen who have a high post in bureaucracy. Khwafi's disciple Jalal al-Din Qa'ini is *muhtasib* of Shahrukh and Sheikh Vefa's Karamani Mehmed Paşa is Grand Vizier of Mehmed II. The nuance between Khwafi and Sheikh Vefa in this context is that Qa'ini is disciple of Khwafi and Khwafi encourages him to participate in the sunnification oriented policies of Shahrukh while there is no record about the Mehmed Paşa's discipleship of Sheikh Vefa. The relation between them seems like no more than a close friendship that comes from Sheikh Vefa's days in Karaman. Karamani Mehmed Paşa protects Sheikh Vefa in certain issues like in the case of Sheikh Vefa's abduction by pirates and Sheikh Vefa protects Karamani Mehmed Paşa with the *wafq* he composed. However, the relation between Sheikh Vefa and Bayezid II does not show the same pattern. In despite of Bayezid's efforts of intimacy after inheriting the throne, Sheikh Vefa does not let him. The reason of this is probably that Sheikh Vefa blames Bayezid II for the murder of Karamani Mehmed Paşa.

Another resemblance between Sheikh Vefa and Khwafi is their approach to the Sunni sects. Khwafi advises his disciples to integrate all Sunni sects in their religious services. Sheikh Vefa, in accordance with that recites *basmala* out loud where he should not do according to the *hanafiyyah*. This move corresponds with the *Shafi'i* sect. Sheikh Vefa does it in despite of strong reaction of Ottoman ulema. His disciple Sinan Paşa defends him against this reaction and Sheikh Vefa does not renounce Khwafi's advice.

The most important change Sheikh Vefa made for the Zayniya order is his approach toward Akbari School. Khwafi and Qudsi show their position against the doctrine of unity of being and both remark some errors made by Ibn 'Arabi. According to this remark, the doctrine of unity of being is a dangerous doctrine since it may give rise to incarnation and unification and this is heresy. But for both of these two Sufis there is a small group of Sufis who believe in the unity of being and they are on the right path. Also, both of Khwafi and Qudsi see the Ibn Arabi's approach of Pharaoh's creed as a wrong approach with respect to sharia. As we showed in the previous chapter, these critics actually a part of the long tradition in refuting Ibn 'Arabi. Neither Khwafi nor Qudsi blames Ibn 'Arabi with heresy or infidelity directly however when they mention the sect of *wujudis* as the heretical group they refuted them by using the exact same arguments when prominent scholars like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun refuting Ibn 'Arabi and his followers. However, Sheikh Vefa, clearly referred Qunawi and Ibn Farid when he is explaining the structure of cosmos and praised Hallaj's and Bistami's ecstatic sayings.

Another important change Sheikh Vefa made is his approach toward the science of letters. Both Khwafi and Qudsi blame *hurūfīs* with heresy and see using science of letters as an indication of heresy. However, Sheikh Vefa praises science of letters with an Akbarian perspective and uses it in his *Sāz-i 'Irfan*.

In the light of these informations, we can position Sheikh Vefa as an Akbari Zayni disciple in Anatolia. He never criticized Khwafi or Qudsi directly however he objected

almost all of their arguments about heresy. The change occurred in the line of Khwafi-Qudsi-Sheikh Vefa says something very important about the term of heresy and that is the term is a historical one that is built upon mainly political concerns not only religious ones. There is no universal meaning of the term that is valid in every geography and age. In Herat, *Hurufis* tried to kill Shahrukh and Khwafi labeled *Hurufis* as heretics. Qudsi maintained the term's meaning and extended its reference. Sheikh Vefa used the science of letters. Khwafi and Qudsi was under the influence of a long tradition of refuting Ibn 'Arabi. This tradition was using a problematic and *post facto* built image of Ibn 'Arabi by using problematic clichés that are a distorted version of Ibn 'Arabi's and his followers' authentic doctrines. However, Sheikh Vefa was coming from another tradition that is built in his hometown Konya, Akbari School. In this tradition, Ibn 'Arabi was neither a heretic nor danger for the very community of Islam but he was the Greatest Master and Ibn 'Arabi was a great saint in the eyes of Sultans whom Sheikh Vefa lived under their rule, Ottoman State. So, there was no problem in the eye of Sheikh Vefa in adopting Ibn 'Arabi's doctrines and he appeared as an Akbari Zayni sheikh in Istanbul.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The main questions of this were: How do the ideas of Zayni dervishes in Anatolia about Ibn 'Arabi differ from those of founder of the tariqa, Zayn al-Din Khwafi? How do Sufis react to different cultural and intellectual contexts when they carry a tariqa from one place to another? Do they strictly follow the rules implemented by their sheikhs or do they adopt the ideas of their new home?

I argue that most of the second-generation Zaynis, who lived in Anatolia in the fifteenth century, differed from the master of their tariqa Zayn al-Din Khwafi and had a favorable view of Ibn 'Arabi, and that others of this generation chose to keep silent about him. Zayn al-Din Khwafi did not directly condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy; however, he adopted the terminology and argumentation of a long-tradition that implicated him as heretic. Qudsi, a first-generation Zayni, who was the disciple of Khwafi and moved to Anatolia from Jerusalem to disseminate the tariqa, followed in the footsteps of Khwafi on this issue, which means Qudsi also adopted the same terminology and argumentation that implicates Ibn 'Arabi as heretic. Nevertheless, by the second-generation, we see figures who were both members of the Akbari School and the Zayniyya tariqa in Anatolia. These Anatolian Zaynis defended Ibn 'Arabi's position against the refutations of their predecessors in tariqa. In this , I tried to contextualize this change by examining the major intellectual, cultural, and political conditions they lived in.

After the failed attempt on Shahrukh's life in 1427, harsh measures were imposed against *Hurufis*. In his *Manhaj*, Khwafi supported and legitimized Shahrukh's crackdown on several groups. Khwafi described heresy and counted the names and aspects of the heretic groups of his time. These were sophists, materialists, philosophers, and *wujudiyan*. It is not difficult to identify the contemporary groups that Khwafi had in mind when he wrote about heretics. These were the

Nurbakhshiyya tariqa and *Hurufis*. When Shahrukh reacted against these groups, he welcomed Khwafi's legitimization of his actions.

The distribution of power was amorphous and diverse during this age. Rulers had substantial powers, but the learned class also commanded significant authority. Thus, an endorsement from a prominent scholar of Khwafi's caliber would have strengthened Shahrukh's hand in his extensive persecution of Sufi groups. In turn, Khwafi had the chance to eliminate some of his rivals, like Samarqandi and Qasim Anwar.

Khwafi's evaluations and refutation of the sect he named as *wujudiyan* was significant. Khwafi did not condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy. He even counted his name among the Sufis of the right path. However, he definitely viewed his ideas as dangerous, since most of those he called heretics derived their ideas from Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of oneness of being. When Khwafi was describing the problematic ideas of the *wujudiyan*, he mentions this concept and says that the followers of this doctrine commit blasphemy. Moreover, Khwafi criticizes Ibn 'Arabi's position on the faith of Pharaoh and the seal of sainthood. He says that these ideas of Ibn 'Arabi did not suit the precepts of sharia. Khwafi's views on the *wujudiyan* and his criticisms of Pharaoh's faith and the seal of sainthood show that Khwafi was talking within a tradition in refuting Ibn 'Arabi. Even the term *wujudiyan* itself was a term that had been used by prominent scholars of earlier ages like Ibn Taymiyya and Taftazani to implicate Ibn 'Arabi.

In acting the way they did, Shahrukh and Khwafi were not motivated solely by political concerns; they might also have had sincere religious concerns. In this sense, Knysh's term of "orthodoxy-in-the-making" is useful. In Khwafi's mind, Ibn 'Arabi was among the Sufis whose ideas had the potential to destroy the unity of the Islamic community. Khwafi did not condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy, but declared each sect who followed Ibn 'Arabi's problematic ideas to be heretics.

An examination of the ideas recorded in the books of the most prominent first-generation Zayni sheikh, ‘Abd al-Latif Qudsi shows that Qudsi strictly followed his sheikh Khwafi on the issues of heresy and Ibn ‘Arabi, as well as those of spiritual stations and levels (*maqamat wa-maratib*) and cosmological realms (*a’lam*). Qudsi’s *Kashf al-I’tiqad* resembles Khwafi’s *Manhaj* in many respects. It is almost an extended version of Khwafi’s *Manhaj*. Qudsi counts twenty-one heretic sects, including the four sects counted by Khwafi. Among these sects, the *Hurufis* and *wujudiyan* stand out. Qudsi gives a long list of *Hurufi* heretics. In the margins of the text, Qudsi adds more heretics he met during his voyage to Anatolia. The term *Hurufi* exceeds its literal meaning in the mind of Qudsi, since most of the names he counted did not use science of letters. In the mind of Qudsi, it seems as though, the term *Hurufi* was close to term heretic, and also applied to many people.

This change in the meaning of term probably originated from Khwafi who witnessed the regicide attempt in Herat. The interesting thing about Qudsi’s evaluations of heretics is that he did not employ the term heretic (*mulhid*) but used instead the term “lured” (*maftunin*). This is the same term Ibn Taymiyya used when he criticized Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers. On the subject of Ibn ‘Arabi, Qudsi did not directly condemn Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers for heresy. However, in describing the lured sect *wujudiyan*, Qudsi employed two terms: unification (*ittihad*) and incarnation (*hulul*). According to Qudsi, the *wujudiyan* defended the doctrine of absolute unity (*wahda al-mutlaqa*) and their roots were found in the Sufis. Qudsi claimed that their ideas caused the heretical ideas of unification and incarnation. In addition, he gave examples from two great Sufis of the early age, Hallaj Mansur and Bayazid Bistami, with respect to problematic statements they uttered during a state of ecstasy: *ana’l-haqq* and *subhani ma a’zama shani*. Qudsi says that he rejected their statements as he rejected the statements of Christians. These terms are the same terms that were used by prominent scholars, like Ibn Taymiyya, Taftazani, and Ibn Khaldun, of the earlier age in their refutations of doctrine of the oneness of being of Ibn ‘Arabi and his followers. In this sense, even though Qudsi does not blame Ibn ‘Arabi directly, he speaks with the same tone of these earlier scholars. Beside this similarity, Qudsi also

criticizes other problematic statements of Ibn 'Arabi on Pharaoh's faith and the state of infidels in hell.

Qudsi, in his *Tuhfa Wahib*, explains the cosmological realms and spiritual stations and levels. This book shows similarity with the Akbari School's doctrine of levels of existence. However, a closer examination of this book reveals that Qudsi used a more popular version of this doctrine, one used by Sufis even before Ibn 'Arabi. Also, Qudsi explains these realms from bottom to top, the opposite of the pattern used by Akbari Sufis, who explain these realms from the top down as an explanation of the creation of universe and theophany of God. In this sense, Qudsi explains these realms as levels that will be experienced by spiritual seekers. This approach is more suitable to Khwafi's approach.

Qudsi adopts a different attitude when it comes to relations and experiences at the practical and social level. The poem he wrote for the most important member of the Akbari School in Anatolia during the age, Molla Fenari, is standing out in this regard. Qudsi praised Molla Fenari greatly by calling him "Imam of the century, you are unique in science and reason in this age."⁴⁹⁸ Qudsi, as a scholar who condemned followers of Ibn 'Arabi for heresy, showed intimacy to the most important member of the Akbari School in Anatolia. Another important incident is Qudsi's mystical experience when he visited Qunawi's tomb in Konya. There, he sees that a branch catches him by his robe and pulls him toward to settle at Qunawi's lodge and use it as the center of his activities. But this experience can also be interpreted as a change that occurred in the ideas of Qudsi toward Ibn 'Arabi and his followers. As I mentioned, Qudsi finished writing of his *Kashf al-I'tiqad* in Damascus and added more names of heretics to the book he met during his voyage to Anatolia. In this book, he refuted the problematic issues of Ibn 'Arabi. When, he came to Anatolia, a branch from the tomb of Qunawi pulled Qudsi to itself as if it was trying to pull Qudsi toward the intellectual inheritance of Ibn 'Arabi.

⁴⁹⁸ Tek, *Abdüllatif Kudsi*, 316.

I suggest that this difference between ideas and practices of Qudsi demonstrates that Qudsi is a figure of transition in the change that occurred in the ideas of Zaynis toward Ibn 'Arabi and his intellectual inheritance.

In chapter 4, I explained the tradition of scholarly refutation used against Ibn 'Arabi. By doing so, I tried to contextualize Khwafi's and Qudsi's criticisms of Ibn 'Arabi and show that even if both Khwafi and Qudsi did not directly condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy, they were speaking within this long tradition. To contextualize the criticisms of Khwafi and Qudsi, I determined topics as benchmarks to illuminate Zaynis' attitude toward Ibn 'Arabi: the oneness of being doctrine, the faith of Pharaoh, the seal of sainthood, the comparison of sainthood with prophethood, and state of infidels in hell. I tried to show that these topics were frequently used by anti-Ibn 'Arabi Sufis and scholars in refuting Ibn 'Arabi. In this sense, for example, Ibn Taymiyya and Taftazani criticize Ibn 'Arabi harshly by claiming that his doctrine of oneness of being causes unification and incarnation. Another remarkable similarity is that Ibn Taymiyya uses the term of lured (*maftun*) when he is refuting Ibn 'Arabi and his followers. These topics were frequently used by later scholars in their refutations of Ibn 'Arabi. Even if Qudsi and Khwafi did not condemn Ibn 'Arabi for heresy directly, they were speaking with same terminology and same approach when they were speaking about the sect of *wujudiyan*.

I also used these five benchmarks to illuminate the attitudes of second-generation Zaynis, who are Anatolian, toward Ibn 'Arabi. In chapter 5, I examined five second-generation Zayni sheikhs, four of whom showed that they were upheld positions close to those of Ibn 'Arabi on these five problematic issues. Before the examination of these five sheikhs, I offered a brief discussion about the influence of Ibn 'Arabi in the early Ottoman world. I did this to show that the political, intellectual, and cultural context in which Ottoman scholars and Sufis operated was different from the context in Herat. They did not experience what Khwafi and Qudsi experienced. Consequently, their concept of heresy was different from the concept of heresy of Khwafi and Qudsi. One of these differences was that Ibn 'Arabi was not a dangerous figure in the minds of most Ottoman scholars, Sufis, and Ottoman sultans. They instead accepted him as

the greatest sheikh and patron saint. So, in examining the Zayni sheikhs, we see that all of them defend the position of Ibn 'Arabi on the various problematic issues that we used as benchmarks above.

Of the five Zayni sheikhs I discussed, Molla Fenari was the most important member of the Akbari School in Anatolia during the age. He was part of a direct chain of students and teachers extending back to Ibn 'Arabi. He was also most probably a disciple of Qudsi. He wrote commentaries on books belonging to members of the Akbari School. The most important commentary was his *Misbah al-Uns*. This was a commentary written on Qunawi's *Miftah al-Ghayb*. Kutbüddinzade İzniki was student of Molla Fenari. He was also a member of the Akbari School. Like his teacher, İzniki wrote a commentary on Qunawi's *Miftah al-Ghayb* entitled *Fath Miftah al-Ghayb*. Piri Halife, another Zayni sheikh, is famous with his commentary, entitled *Zubdat al-Tahqiq*, on Qunawi's *Nusus*. In this sense, these three Zayni Sufis promoted Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of oneness of being (*wahda al-wujud*). Among these three names, Piri Halife also defended Ibn 'Arabi's position in comparing sainthood to prophethood. İzniki, on the other hand, is an interesting example since he does not agree with Ibn 'Arabi on the issue of Pharaoh's faith, since he says that Pharaoh's faith was compulsory, not voluntary and hence was not accepted. About the issue of state of infidels in hell, he adopts an approach similar to that of Ibn 'Arabi. However, he refers to the statements of Imam Ghazzali and Tirmidhi, but not Ibn 'Arabi.

Şehabeddin Sivasi, the fourth Zayni sheikh I discussed, seems not to have been interested in any of these five benchmarks in his books. However, he gives Ibn 'Arabi as a part of his chain of initiation. The position of Sivasi needs more examination. I cannot claim that he was a member of Akbari School like the other four Zaynis, since there is no reference to the Zayniyya tariqa or Ibn 'Arabi in his books, except in his chain of initiation in which I claimed that inclusion of Ibn 'Arabi's name was probably an error.

Sheikh Vefa, the fifth Zayni sheikh I discussed, is the outstanding figure of chapter 5, and the strongest proponent of Ibn 'Arabi among the Zayni Sufis in Anatolia. The four

other Zayni sheikhs I discussed in this chapter serve simply to show that Sheikh Vefa was not alone in his support for Ibn 'Arabi. In his two books, *Saz-i 'Irfan* and *Makam-i Suluk*, he clearly departs from his sheikh Qudsi with respect to Qudsi's ideas about heresy. *Saz-i 'Irfan* is an explanation of Ibn 'Arabi's doctrine of levels of existence. As mentioned in chapter 4, members of the Akbari School used different approaches to explain the levels of existence. Sheikh Vefa's approach coincides with the five divine presences (*hazarat al-khams*) of Qunawi and employs Akbari terminology like immutable entities, first entification, second entification, etc., and he directly refers to two famous books of two prominent Akbari Sufis: Qunawis's *Miftah al-Ghayb* and Ibn Farid's *al-Ta'yya*. Furthermore, Sheikh Vefa uses the science of letters in this book. In the *Makam-i Suluk*, he says that "everything is Him," which is a statement criticized harshly by Khwafi and Qudsi. Furthermore, he describes Bayazid Bistami as sultan and pole of all wises and praises his problematic statement asserted during a state of ecstasy: "All this time I speak with God/People suppose I speak with them." In accounts of the same event in both *Nafahat* and *Shaqa'iq*, we see that Sheikh Vefa endorses Hallaj Mansur's statement "*ana'l-haqq*." This stands in sharp contrast to Qudsi, who, as I noted before, said that he rejected the problematic statements of Hallaj and Bistami as he rejected the statements of the Christians. Furthermore, in the same account, Sheikh Vefa confirms that Pharaoh's faith was valid, which is a statement both Qudsi and Khwafi had viewed as incompatible with sharia.

For my , I also examined other Zayni figures in Anatolia. I saw that none of them were involved in the debates about Ibn 'Arabi. The five individuals I discussed above are the only ones who mention Ibn 'Arabi. All of them, except Sivasi, clearly defend Ibn 'Arabi on the five benchmark issues that were the traditional focus of criticism against him. It is significant that none of the Anatolian Zaynis refuted Ibn 'Arabi, and that five of them accepted him as the greatest master. This is an important change, and proves that the meaning of heresy in their mind was different from that of their tariqa predecessors in Iran.

My first aim was to prove that the concept of heresy had a historical character that changes according to different contexts of different time and spaces. In this sense, heresy is not only a religious concept. Heresy is also a political term that is shaped by

the political concerns of both sultans and the learned class. In this sense, it is wrong to implement a timeless and ahistorical dichotomy of orthodoxy/heterodoxy when studying Islamic cultures. In this manner, I adopted the term of “orthodoxy-in-the-making” of Knysh. This approach showed that the term heresy in the minds of Khwafi and Qudsi and in the minds of the Anatolian Zaynis were completely different since they were thinking, believing, and speaking within different cultural and intellectual traditions. In this manner, I also suggest that we should stop treating Sufi tariqas as if their members were implementing the same rules, giving the same advice, and acting invariably according to a common agenda. Differences between the members of same tariqa were probably greater than similarities, not only in different periods, but also in different places during the same period. Sufis were a lot more independent and free than the literature on Sufism generally makes them out to be. To be painted with a new color or to be fascinated by a new charm was natural, even, as this shows, a crucial subject like heresy.

My second aim was to make a contribution to studies on early intellectual and religious life in the Ottoman territories. I used the Zayniyya tariqa as means to explore one of the major determiners of Ottoman learned class: Ibn ‘Arabi and his intellectual inheritance. As mentioned above, Khwafi, the founder of the Zayniyya, was against Ibn ‘Arabi. His disciple Qudsi was the most important Zayni sheikh who came to Anatolia. In his books, Qudsi adopted the same attitude as his sheikh had against Ibn ‘Arabi and other heretics. However, at the practical level, he showed intimacy with Akbari figures in Anatolia, like Molla Fenari. Also, his experience in Qunawi’s tomb and settlement at the lodge of Qunawi had great significance. Anatolia was a place where direct disciples of Ibn ‘Arabi lived, and was the center of the Akbari School. Beside this intellectual context, Ottoman sultans viewed Ibn ‘Arabi as a patron saint. Sufis in Anatolia a part of this tradition. Consequently, we find Zayni Sufis in Anatolia who were also Akbari, which means they did not adopt the ideas of their predecessors in Zayniyya, Khwafi and Qudsi. Sheikh Vefa stands out in this regard. He explicitly showed that he was not thinking about the issue of heresy in the same ways as his sheikh Qudsi and Khwafi had. He was a Sufi who was closer to the culture of Sufism in Anatolia than his tariqa predecessors had been

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bursa Manuscript and Old Printed Books Library (BEEK):

'Abd al-Latif Qudsi, *Kashf al-I'tiqad fi al-Radd 'ala Madhab al-Ilhad*, General, nr. 1479/5.

Süleymaniye Manuscript Library:

'Abd al-Latif Qudsi, *Tuhfa Wahib al-Mawahib fi Bayan al-Maqamat wa-l-Maratib*, Halet Efendi, nr. 246.

Kutbüddinzade İzniki, *Risala fi Qawl Ibn 'Arabi fi Iman Fir'awn*, Ragıp Paşa, nr. 692.

Piri Halife Hamidi, *Zubdat al-Tahqiq wa-Nuzhat al-Tawfiq*, Ayasofya, nr. 4805

Şehabeddin Sivasi, *Jazzab al-Qulub ila Tariq al-Mahbub*, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, nr. 3255.

Şehabeddin Sivasi, *Risala al-Najat min Sharr al-Sifat*, Halet Efendi, nr. 246.

Zayn al-Din Khwafi, *Manhaj al-Rashad ra Wasita-i Salah-i I'tiqad-i 'Ibad*, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, nr. 2829.

Published Primary Sources:

al-Sahawi, Shams al-Din Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Rahman. *al-Daw' al-Lami li-Ehli al-Karni al-Tasi*. Vol. 9. Beyrut: Daru Mektebeti'l-Hayat

Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir Efendi. *Osmanlı Müellifleri*. Edited by A. Fikri Yavuz and İsmail Özen. Vol. 1. İstanbul: Meral Meral Yayınevi.

Ibn 'Arabi. *Harflerin İlmi*. Translated by Mahmut Kanık. Bursa: ASA Kitapevi, 2000.

Ibn 'Arabi. *Mekarimu'l-Ahlak Üstün Ahlak*. İstanbul: Kitsan Basım Yayın, 2005.

Ibn 'Arabi. *The Meccan Revelations*. Edited by Michel Chodkiewicz. Translated by William C. Chittick and James W. Morris. Vol. I. II vols. New York: Pir Press, 2005.

Ibn 'Arabi. *The Meccan Revelations*. Edited by Michel Chodkiewicz. Translated by Cyrille Chodkiewicz and Denis Grill. Vol. II. II vols. New York: Pir Press, 2004.

Konevî, Sadreddin. *Miftâhu'l-Gayb*. Edited by Ekrem Demirli. İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2014.

Lami Çelebi. *Nafahat al-Uns min Hadarat al-Quds*. Edited by Süleyman Uludağ. İstanbul: Marifet Yayınları.

Muhyî-i Gülşenî. *Reşehât-ı Muhyî Reşehât-ı 'Aynü'l-Hayat Tercümesi*. Edited by Mustafa Koç and Eyyüp Tanrıverdi. İstanbul: Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu Başkanlığı, 2014.

Taşköprizade, Ahmed. *al-Shaqa'iq al-Nu'maniyya fi-'Ulama al-Dawla al-'Uthmaniyya*. Edited by Ahmed Subhi Furat. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1985.

Vassaf, Osmanzade Hüseyin. *Sefine-i Evliya*. Edited by Mehmet Akkuş and Ali Yılmaz. Vol. I. İstanbul: Kitabevi, 2015.

Vicdani, Sadık. *Tomar-ı Tutuk-ı Aliyye - Kadiriyye*. İstanbul: Daru'l-Hilafetu'l-Aliyye ve Matbaa-i Amire, 1338-1340.

Unpublished Master Theses and Ph.D. Dissertations:

Erdemir, Avni. "Muslihu'd-Din Mustafa İbn Vefâ Hayatı, Eserleri, Tesirleri ve Manzum Eserlerinin Tenkidli Metni." PhD diss., Gazi Üniversitesi, 1999.

Khalil, Mohammad Hassan. "Muslim Scholarly Discussion on Salvation and the Fate of 'Others.'" PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2007.

Köle, Bekir. "Zeynüddin-i Hafi Hayatı, Eserleri, Tasavvuf Anlayışı ve el-Vasâya'l-Kudsiyye'nin Tahkiki." MA. Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 2002.

Ökten, Ertuğrul İ.. "Jāmī (817-898/1414-1492): His Biography and Intellectual Influence in Herat." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2007.

Takeshita, Masataka. "Ibn 'Arabi's Theory of the Perfect Man and Its Place in the History of Islamic Thought." PhD diss., The University of Chicago, 1986.

Zildzic, Ahmed. "Friend and Foe: The Early Ottoman reception of Ibn 'Arabi." PhD diss., University of California, 2012.

Published Articles and Books:

Aşkar, Mustafa. *Molla Fenari ve Vahdet-i Vücut Anlayışı*. Ankara: Muradiye Kültür Vakfı Yayınları, 1993.

Aşkar, Mustafa. "Osmanlı Devletinde Alim-Mutasavvıf Prototipi Olarak; İlk Şeyhülislam Molla Fenari ve Tasavvuf Anlayışı." *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 37, no. 1 (1997): 385-401.

Aşkar, Mustafa. "Osmanlı'nın Kuruluş Döneminde bir İbn Arabî Takipçisi: Molla Fenârî ve Vahdet-i Vücûd Anlayışı." In *International Symposium on Molla Fanârî - Proceedings-*, edited by Tevfik Yücedoğlu, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu and U. Murat Kılavuz, 271-290. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010.

Aka, İsmail. *Mirza Şahrûh ve Zamanı (1405-1447)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1994.

Akkaya, Veysel. "Muhyiddin İbnü'l-Arabî'de Arş Tasavvuru ve İstivâ Meselesi." *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies* 33, no. 1 (Spring 2015): 379-392.

Algar, Hamid. "Reflections of Ibn 'Arabi in Early Naqshbandî Tradition." *Journal of Islamic Research* 5, no. 1 (January 1991): 1-20.

Ansari, Abdul Haq. "Ibn 'Arabi: The Doctrine of Wahdat al-Wujud." *Islamic Studies* 38, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 149-192.

Babinger, Franz, and Fuad Köprülü. *Anadolu'da İslamiyet*. Edited by Mehmet Kanar. Translated by Ragıp Hulusi. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 1996.

Bashir, Shahzad. *Messianic Hopes and Mystical Visions: The Nûrbakhshîya Between Medieval and Modern Islam*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 2003.

Binbaş, İlker Evrim. "The Anatomy of a Regicide Attempt: Shāhrukh, the urūfîs, and the Timurid Intellectuals in 830/1426/27." *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*, June 2013: 1-38.

Burckhardt, Titus. *Mystical Astrology According to 'Ibn Arabi*. Louisville, KY: Fons Vitae, 2001.

Chittick, William C. "Rumi and wahdat al-wujud." In *Poetry and Mysticism in Islam: the heritage of Rumi [Giorgio Levi Della Vida Conference (11.: 1987: Los Angeles)]*, edited by Amin Banani, Richard Havannisian and Georges Sabagh, 70-111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Chittick, William C. "The Central Point Qunawi's Role in the School of Ibn 'Arabi." *Journal of Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 35 (2004): 25-46.

Chittick, William C. "The Five Divine Presences: From Al-Qunawi To Al-Qaysari." *The Muslim World* 72, no. 2 (April 1982): 81-158.

Chodkiewicz, Michel. "İbn Arabî'nin Öğretisinin Osmanlı Dünyasında Karşılığı." In *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler Kaynaklar-Doktrin-Ayin ve Erkan-Tarikatlar-Edebiyat-Mimari-İkonografi-Modernizm*, edited by Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, 97-121. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2014.

Clark, Jane. "Early Best-sellers in the Akbarian Tradition: The Dissemination of Ibn 'Arabi's Teaching Through Sadr al-Din Qunawi." *Journal of Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* XXXIII (2003). Accessed May 25, 2017. <http://www.ibnarabisociety.org/articlespdf/bestsellers.pdf>.

Curry, John J. *The Transformation of Muslim Mystical Thought in the Ottoman Empire The Rise of the Halveti Order, 1350-1650*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.

Çakmaklıoğlu, M. Mustafa. "İbnü'l-Arabî'nin Nübüvvet-Velayet Hakkındaki Görüşleri ve İbn Teymiyye'nin Bu Husustaki Eleştirileri." *Tasavvuf* 21 (2008): 213-255.

Çınar, Fatih. "Bir Mutasavvıf Olarak Şihâbüddin Es-Sivâsî ve "Cezzâbü'l-Kulûb" İsimli Eseri Bağlamında Bazı Tasavvufî Görüşleri." *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 1, no. 37 (2013): 239-266.

Dartma, Bahattin. "Beylikler Devrinin Mümtaz ve Mütevazi Bir Şahsiyeti: Şihabuddin es-Sivasi." In *Selçuklular Döneminde Sivas, Sempozyum Bildirileri 29 Eylül-1 Ekim 2005*, edited by İbrahim Yasak, 222-233. Sivas: Sivas Valiliği, 2006.

Demirli, Ekrem. *Tasavvufun Altın Çağı Konevi ve Takipçileri*. İstanbul: Sufi Kitap, 2015.

Erünsal, İsmail E. "Şeyh Vefa ve Vakıfları Hakkında Yeni Bir Belge." *İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1 (1997): 47-64.

Ergin, Osman. "Şadraddîn al-Qunawi ve Eserleri." *Şarkiyat Mecmuası* II, no. 64 (1957): 63-90.

Ernst, Carl W. "Controversy Over Ibn 'Arabi's Fusus: The Faith of Pharaoh." *Islamic Culture* LIX (July 1985): 259-66.

Gülgen, Hicabi. "Molla Fenârî Camii Haziresi Mezar Taşları." In *International Symposium on Molla Fanârî –Proceedings-*, edited by Tevfik Yücedoğru, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu and U. Murat Kılavuz, 111-128. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Mezar Taşları, 2010.

Gülle, Sıtkı. "İlk Osmanlı Şeyhü'lislâm'ı Şemseddîn Muhammed b. Hamza Fenârî (751-834/1350-1431) ve Onun Aynu'l-A'yân Tefsiri." *İstanbul İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 1 (1999): 237-246.

Godlas, Alan. "Molla Fanârî and the Mişbâh al-Uns: The Commentator and The Perfect Man." In *International Symposium on Molla Fanârî -Proceedings-*, edited by Tevfik Yücedoğru, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu, U. Murat Kılavuz and Kadir Gömbeyaz, 31-46. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010.

Köle, Bekir. *Zeynüddin Hafi ve Tasavvufi Görüşleri*. İstanbul, 2011.

Kılıç, Mahmut Erol. "Ekberiyye." In *Türkiye'de Tarikatlar Tarih ve Kültür*, edited by Semih Ceyhan, 337-372. İstanbul: İSAM Yayınları, 2015.

Kılıç, Mahmut Erol. *Şeyh-i Ekber İbn Arabi Düşüncesine Giriş*. İstanbul: Sufi Kitap, 2017.

Kılıç, Mahmut Erol. *İbnü'l-Arabi*. İstanbul: İSAM, 2015.

Kara, Mustafa. *Türk Tasavvuf Tarihi Araştırmaları Tarikatlar-Tekkeler-Şeyhler*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2010.

Karadaş, Çağfer. "Muhyiddin İbn Arabî'nin İtikâdı." *Tasavvuf İlmi ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 21 (2008): 67-94.

Kissling, Hans Joachim. "Einiges über den Zejnîje Orden im Osmanischen Reiche." *Der Islam* XXXIX (1964): 143-179.

Knysh, Alexander. *Ibn 'Arabi in the Later Islamic Tradition The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1999.

Knysh, Alexander. "'Orthodoxy' and 'Heresy' in Medieval Islam: An Essay in Reassessment." *The Muslim World* LXXXIII, no. 1 (January 1993): 48-67.

Langer, Robert, and Udo Simon. "The Dynamics of Orthodoxy and Heterodoxy. Dealing with Divergence in Muslim Discourses and Islamic Studies." *Die Welt des Islams* 48, no. 3/4 (2008): 273-278.

Le Gall, Dina. *A Culture of Sufism Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450-1700*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power Volume 3: Global Empires and Revolution, 1890-1945*. Vol. 3. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Manz, Beatrice Forbes. *Power, Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Norris, H. T. "The Mir'ât al-Ṭālibîn, by Zain al-Dīn al-Khawāfī of Khurāsān and Herat." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 53 (1990): 57-63.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler 15-17. Yüzyıllar*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2013.

Ormsby, Eric. "The Faith of Pharaoh: A Disputed Question in Islamic Theology." *Studia Islamica* 98/99 (2004): 5-28.

Öngören, Reşat. *Osmanlı Devleti'nin İlk Şeyhülislâmı Molla Fenâri'nin Tasavvufî Yönü*. Vol. 11, in *Türkler*, edited by Hasan Celal Güzel, Kemal Çiçek and Salim Koca, 114-119. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2002.

Öngören, Reşat. *Osmanlılar'da Tasavvuf Anadolu'da Sufiler, Devlet ve Ulema (XVI. Yüzyıl)*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık, 2012.

Öngören, Reşat. *Tarihte Bir Aydın Tarikatı Zeyniler*. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları, 2003.

Papas, Alexandre. "Toward a New History of Sufism: The Turkish Case." *History of Religions* 46, no. 1 (August 2006): 81-90.

Redhouse, Sir James W. *Turkish and English Lexicon New Edition*. İstanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 2011.

Renard, John. *The A to Z of Sufism*. Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, 2009.

Schimmel, Annemarie. *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1975.

Shaw, Stanford. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Subtelny, Maria E. *Timurids in Transition Turko-Persian Politics and Acculturation in Medieval Iran*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Subtelny, Maria Eva, and Anas B. Khalidov. "The Curriculum of Islamic Higher Learning in Timurid Iran in the Light of the Sunni Revival under Shāh-Rukh ." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115 (Apr. - Jun. 1995): 210-236.

Tek, Abdurrezzak. *Abdüllatif Kudsi Hayatı, Eserleri ve Görüşleri*. Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2007.

Tek, Abdurrezzak. "Molla Fenârî'nin Tasavvufî Kimliği." In *International Symposium on Molla Fanârî –Proceedings-*, edited by Tevfik Yücedoğru, Orhan Ş. Koloğlu and U. Murat Kılavuz, 441-458. Bursa: Bursa Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2010.

Tek, Abdurrezzak. *Tarihi Süreçte Tasavvuf ve Tarikatlar*. Bursa: Emin Yayınları, 2016.

Togan, Zeki Velidi. "Büyük Türk Hükümdarı Şahruh." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* 2-3 (1949): 520-538.

Tosun, Necdet. "Timur ve Timurluların Tasavvuf Ehli ile Münasebetleri." In *Ölümünün 600. Yılında Emir Timur ve Mirası Uluslararası Sempozyumu*, edited by Abdulvahap Kara and Ömer İşbilir, 407-418. İstanbul: Doğu Kütüphanesi, 2007.

Trimingham, J. Spencer. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971.

Uludağ, Süleyman. *Tasavvuf Terimleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Kabalcı, 2016.

Yıldırım, Aydın, and Edip Yılmaz. "İlk Osmanlı Şeyhülişlâmı Molla Fenâri." *Diyanet İlmî Dergi* 31, no. 3 (1995): 71-81.

Yüksel, Musa Şamil. "Şahruh'un Sünnî Canlandırma Siyaseti." *Tarih Okulu* 5 (2009): 95-110.